

# MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES.

Baltimore, February, 1898.

## AMERICA'S SHARE IN THE RE-GENERATION OF BULGARIA. (1840-1859.)

### I.

THROUGH four hundred years of Turkish oppression the Greeks never lost the consciousness of their former glory, and dreamt of the reestablishment of their independence. Their aspirations were kindled to a new flame in the beginning of our century, when they received the warm moral support of the cultured of Europe who, as if in repayment for their services in the Renaissance, were burning with the desire to see all the Greeks gathered in under the rule of classical Athens. At last their struggles were crowned with success in the establishment of the temporary government under the presidency of Capodistria. The country, however, presented a sad spectacle. The rich and the educated were living abroad in the large capitals of Western Europe, or at Odessa, Alexandria, and in the Phanar quarter of Constantinople. In the Morea, the poverty of the ignorant populace was unparalleled. Capodistria did his very best to introduce a system of primary schools, but the exchequer was drained, there were to be found few suitable teachers, and scarcely any textbooks in the vernacular, or in that mixed dialect which aimed at making the ancient Greek the literary form.

The Anglo-Saxon world, among whom there were to be found the most enthusiastic Philhellenes, came to his rescue. Lord Guilford built and endowed a Greek University on the island of Corfu, while American missionaries, uniting their enthusiasm with their native sense for the practical, took an active part in building up the lower schools. In 1831 there were in the Peloponesos one hundred and seventy-two schools with less than ten thousand pupils; that is, about one schoolboy to every three hundred inhabitants. Girl schools did not exist until a preacher of the Gospel from Massachusetts, Jonas King, braving persecution on account of heterodoxy, established

them along with schools for boys. In 1832 there was associated with him Elias Riggs who had just graduated from Amherst College. They translated Woodbury's *Geography*, Paley's *Arithmetic*, Gallaudet's *Psychology*, Cutler's *Physiology*, and other American schoolbooks, and printed them in their own printing establishment, one of the very first in the country. Nor was Capodistria slow in discovering the praiseworthy activity of the men from beyond the Atlantic, and in a rescript of February 8-20, 1831 (Document No. 1915), he begged the Secretary of the American Board of Foreign Missions, Mr. Anderson, to express his thanks to his people in New York and to invoke their continued aid.

The missionary efforts for the evangelization of Greece dates from an earlier period. In the beginning of the twenties, the American Press at Malta had been issuing a vast number of religious and semi-religious tracts, intended for the Greeks of the Ionian Islands, Asia Minor, and Greece Proper. The educational importance of these tracts has been much greater than one would be inclined to suppose, for while the Greek presses of Vienna, Venice and Paris supplied the higher classes of society with some kind of a literature, there was absolutely nothing readable in existence for the masses. It need not at all surprise us, then, to hear of the great eagerness with which the pamphlets and books of the American missionaries were bought up. Fortunately for the nascent consciousness of the people, the Americans were in full sympathy with the popular language, and naturally enough. It was their purpose to reach the hearts and minds of the common people who had been badly cared for by their more fortunate brothers and by the Orthodox Church, and to achieve this end they had to speak to them in an intelligible dialect.

For the same reason they furnished the Greeks with a translation of the Bible made but one hundred and fifty years before. But the language having in the meantime become antiquated, the British and Foreign Bible Society set about to provide them with a more modern version of the whole Testament.

Bishop Hilarion was singled out by them to do that work. In 1821, during the darkest days for the Greeks at Constantinople when "even Franks were scarcely respected," he was intrusted with the labor. He, of all the ecclesiastics, was alone in full sympathy with the missionaries, in fact it may be said he was their creation. Hilarion never forgot to acknowledge his dependence on the Bible Society, as is evident from his letters to Rev. H. D. Leees, the Society's agent in Turkey. In a letter of September 13, 1821 to the office in London, Leees says ;

"I have lately received a letter from Hilarion, informing me that the transcription of this manuscript was completed, and that he was preparing to depart for his Bishopric. As you may like to see a little of the Bishop's sentiments, I translate a portion of his letter. 'I take with me,' he says, 'my Manuscript, that when, with God's permission, I arrive at my diocese, and enjoy quiet, I may pursue the revision and correction of it. Both I and my assistant here have ceased from our labours, on account of the fearful circumstances which have occurred; but God, whose providence watches over good undertakings, will not suffer this, which has for its object the common good, to remain unfinished! Friend and brother, I implore God for this reason alone, to grant me life, that I may finish this work, and that I may thus manifest my gratitude to the Bible Society, which has chosen me to be its minister in this labour, and may fulfil my obligations to my nation, by the completion of this undertaking which is dear to God.'

In the same letter he announces that with Hilarion's aid he has been able to procure a suitable person to translate the Bible into Albanian. In another, from Hilarion to the Patriarch of Constantinople, Anthimus, and the Holy Synod of the Greek Church, written in 1827, we again find him acknowledging his obligations to the Bible Society :

"Although the sublimity of the divine thoughts of Scripture does not admit of change, and the giving them another form is a difficult task to the feebleness of human understandings, it is nevertheless of the first necessity that we should at least dissipate the darkness with which the language involves them, and render the latter so clear, as that the Scriptures may become as comprehensible as they can be to the understanding of those who read them. And it was perhaps necessary that this should have been done many years ago, in order that the reading of the Holy Scriptures might

become more general; but different circumstances which have occurred from time to time, and perhaps a negligence and want of zeal for good things, have been the cause, that this measure of public utility has never been undertaken until these our days; nor perhaps would it even now have been undertaken, had not the British Bible Society, with a benevolent zeal, taken it under its care.

"This renowned and useful Society (to which all nations owe infinite thanks) having perceived, from experience, that the divinely inspired morality of these sacred books is able to change the manners of men from barbarism to civilization, from disorder to order, from the life of beasts to that of men, moved by religious zeal, voluntarily undertook the care of translating, at its own expense, all the sacred books of the Old and New Testament into all the languages spoken throughout the world, and to publish them for the common benefit of men; and, up to the present day, it has published them in upwards of eighty dialects. This Society having found the translation of the New Testament made one hundred and fifty years back, from the Hellenic into our modern language, published it in London, and, with the permission of the Patriarch, distributed it. But, afterwards, having received information of the bad style of this translation, they engaged me to make a new translation, both of the New Testament, and of the sacred books of the Old."

Hilarion was during the greater part of his life Archbishop of Ternovo in Bulgaria.

## II.

The Bulgarian Kingdom, which at one time had been the terror of Byzantium, was completely crushed by the Turks after the battle on the Field of Blackbirds and the sack of Ternovo at the end of the fourteenth century. The flower of the Bulgarian youth was drafted into the Turkish army where they constituted the formidable troops of the Janissaries, and at one time nearly all the officers of the palace were Bulgarians so that their language practically became the court language at Constantinople. But those who remained at home were turned into a nation of slaves, paying heavy taxes to their oppressors. The last vestige of their independent existence was wiped out when one of the Sultans, in classifying his subjects according to their religions, mentioned the Bulgarians together with the Greeks.

This gave the latter the supremacy in spiritual matters, and henceforth to the heavy

burden of Turkish rule was superadded the intollerable yoke of the clergy, which was entirely recruited in the Phanar quarter of Constantinople. These lived on the life blood of the nation, enriching themselves at the expense of the poor peasants. They had no interest in the intellectual welfare of the masses, and Bulgaria, once the seat of Slavic learning, became the most ignorant of European countries. Whatever few schools did exist before the first quarter of this century were all taught in Greek; the service was held in that ancient language, doubly unintelligible to the Slavic masses.

Under these conditions the inhabitants of Macedonia, nearest to Greece, and therefore thrown in contact with that country, became bilingual, using their own despised dialect only in the narrow circle of their homes, nay, whole cities became completely hellenized.

When, in the memory of men still living, Bulgaria for the first time woke from its lethargy of more than four hundred years, it had no traditions, no literature, in fact no language ready for literary use, for during that period the idiom had passed through strange vicissitudes. The Bulgarian language, rich in inflections, uncontaminated by foreign influence, except through the Greek, had been used by the protoapostles of the Slavs, Cyril and Methodius, in the translation of the New Testament and other works. When, in the twelfth century, Russia became the leading Slavic country, its many monasteries began to supply the rest of the Orthodox Slavic world with a religious and apocryphal literature. The language used in these productions was the Old Church Slavic influenced in forms and phonetics by the spoken dialects of Russia. This Slavic language of the Russian redaction thus became the official language of the Church even in Bulgaria and in Servia, where it is still used for this purpose.

In the meantime the spoken idiom of Bulgaria, unimpeded by the controlling influence of a literary norm, was departing more and more from its parent language. It differs now in two important particulars from all its sister idioms in that it has almost entirely lost its many case endings, and in that it has developed a postpositive article, such as is found

in Roumanian and Albanian.

The Bulgarians were for the first time roused from their torpid state in 1762 by manuscript copies of Paisius' *Slavo-Bulgarian History of the Bulgarian People, its Kings and Saints*. The author, a monk at Mount Athos, was not a critical historian, but his work breathed such warm patriotism that it atoned for its many defects of scholarship and became instrumental in creating a nucleus of a national party, and kept ablaze the little spark of culture which managed to penetrate into their benighted country. Under the influence of this impetus, his pupil Sophronius published in 1806 his *Sermons for Weekdays and Holidays*, in which one of the modern Bulgarian dialects was for the first time used in a printed book. The conditions were, however, not favorable for the use of this new idiom or for the development of a literature, and before the year 1827 there were less than a dozen books extant in which there was made any attempt at approaching the speech of the people. In a letter from Mr. Lees to the British and Foreign Bible Society of January 18, 1827, there is given a good account of the state of learning in Bulgaria at that time, and there is also foreshadowed in it the course which henceforth Anglo-Saxons, both English and Americans, will take in order to assist this Slavic country in forming a native literature:

"It appears that the Greeks (the Bulgarian bishops being always Greeks, named by the Patriarch and Synod at Constantinople) have laboured to introduce the use of their own language as much as possible among this nation; and in all the country to the south of the Balcan, (and after quitting Adrianople the whole Christian population is Bulgarian) the custom of reading the service in Greek almost universally prevails: and whatever schools are established, the Greek language alone is taught. On the other side of the Balcan, however, that is to say, in Bulgaria Proper, the church service is read in the ancient Slavonian (the mother of the Bulgarian dialect) everywhere except at Ternovo, the metropolis, where the custom of reading in Greek has also been introduced. Slavonian books are also read in the schools. The modern Bulgarian is, however, so far changed from the mother tongue, that the people can understand little or nothing of what they hear in church; and numbers of the priests, from want of education, are much in the same circumstances with the people. When, in addi-

tion to this, it is considered that the Bulgarians have scarcely any books in their spoken language, it will appear absolutely impossible that they should be anything but what they are—extremely ignorant. All the individuals of this nation who acquire any tincture of learning, and they are very few, are necessarily obliged to seek it through the medium of another language. A small beginning is at present being made to the cultivation of the Bulgarian tongue, in which two elementary works have lately been published; the one a spelling-book, to which is appended a treatise on arithmetic, and a few particulars of natural history; and the other an abridged history of the Old and New Testament; both translated from the Greek. The language has not yet been reduced to rules, and a grammar and lexicon are still desiderata. The above works have been executed by Bulgarians, who have left their country, and obtained some education in Wallachia or Germany: and the few schoolmasters resident in Bulgaria who have any reputation for learning, have enjoyed this advantage. The hand of the Turks weighs heavy upon this people, interesting and estimable in many respects; but light will, I trust, soon break in upon them; and this, *it is evident, can only be effectually diffused by the cultivation of their spoken tongue.*"

### III.

From another passage in the letter just mentioned we learn that the British and Foreign Bible Society was then trying to find suitable persons to translate the New Testament into Bulgarian. Its agents had induced the Archbishop of Adrianople to commission two priests at Selimnia to commence the labor, but this work was not executed to the satisfaction of the Society and was at once rejected. These priests had translated only a portion of the first Gospel and had stopped their work when they heard that the Archbishop at Ternovo, Hilarion, was employed in a similar undertaking. But even this latter translation seems to have been abandoned when it was learned that Sapunov of Bucharest had made his arrangements for printing his edition of twelve hundred copies of the New Testament. That was welcome news to Mr. Leeves, and in reporting it in a letter of August 11, 1827, he exclaims: "I am glad, for my own part, that this beginning will be made by themselves."

The following year his Gospels were printed at the press of the Metropolitan of Wallachia, and in a few years four hundred copies were

sold by him in his immediate neighborhood. But from a lack of enthusiasm and on account of the disturbed state of Turkey as the result of its war with Russia, he made no effort to sell the rest, and in 1834 they had not yet been disposed of, when Mr. Barker began to make overtures for the purchase of the eight hundred copies which Sapunov still had on hand. Before consummating the transaction, Mr. Barker went with a copy of the Gospels from Bucharest to Ternovo, in order to consult Hilarion on the genuineness and comprehensibility of the language employed in the translation. He was disappointed at not meeting him, for he was away on his annual round in his diocese. So he turned for advice to the Protosingellos, the priest next in dignity, and the latter informed him that

"they were not only exact, but also the language was well adapted for the poor, being that which they speak in the extensive bishopric under Hilarion's care, and, for what he knew, they would be understood all over Bulgaria."

A translation which had been prepared in the same year by Fotinov, a Bulgarian teacher in Smyrna, in Asia Minor, had been rejected "as being neither Slavonian nor Bulgarian, but a mixture of both." Not satisfied with the statement made by the Protosingellos, Mr. Barker carried Sapunov's translation wherever he went, and had it subjected to a close scrutiny. On October 16 of the same year he was able to announce that

"Sapounoff's Bulgarian Gospels were everywhere understood; and though some words in that work are different to those in use in those parts, still the language is such as to be comprehensible both to rich and poor."

It had been the intention of the Bible Society to get a complete translation of the New Testament and to print it in London, but this plan, too, was soon abandoned when Mr. Barker succeeded in 1836 in making

"arrangements for obtaining a translation which is likely to prove more satisfactory, and to which Archbishop Hilarion has kindly promised to give his sanction."

This new man employed in the task of furnishing the Bulgarians with the new Testament was Neophytes of Ryla, a monastery under Hilarion's jurisdiction. We have seen how the Archbishop of Ternovo had been in-

fluenced by the foreign missionaries to favor religious instruction in the native language of the people; it was, therefore, natural for him to depart still farther from the practices of the Phanariot priests in Bulgaria by directly encouraging the efforts of the Anglo-Saxon missionaries to promote popular instruction. At that time the Lancasterian schools were very popular in the South-East of Europe. They owed their origin to an English missionary whose name they bore, and were based on the principle of mutual instruction by the pupils themselves; they were specially intended for those parts of the world where teachers and books were not easily to be had, and for that reason found ready acceptance in those regions where the missionaries were active.

In the Turkish Empire most of these schools owed their origin to the efforts of the preachers of the Gospel, while many of them, notably those at Syra, Athens, Smyrna, Constantinople were directly under the charge of Americans. When Hilarion had made up his mind to give Bulgaria a native school, he selected Neophy whole of Ryla to be its first teacher. He sent him to Bucharest to get acquainted with the methods of the Lancasterian schools, and after Neophy whole's return began his activity as a pedagogue and writer of schoolbooks. One of these was a Grammar of the spoken language. Although written in a discursive style and permitting certain forms of the older tongue, it still deserves creditable mention as the first attempt to establish rules for the modern idiom. The following year after the appearance of this work, Neophy whole was engaged, through Hilarion's instrumentality, to write a translation of the whole New Testament for the British and Foreign Bible Society.

#### IV.

The usefulness of the American missionaries in Greece was cut short by restrictive measures of King Otho who, upon becoming of age, had himself assumed the reigns of government, and had yielded to the pressure brought to bear upon him by the Orthodox bishops. He issued an edict that only the Greek Catholic religion could be taught in schools established by foreigners. One by one the Greek missions were abandoned, or transferred to places outside the pale of the

influence of the Church. Mr. Riggs was ordered in 1838 to repair to Smyrna on the Aegean Sea. The choice of that city as a base of operation was a particularly fortunate one, for from that place various nations could be easily reached, while the Turkish Government did not do anything to impede the work of the Protestants.

Henceforth Smyrna became the central depot of distribution and publication of schoolbooks and religious literature. The British and Foreign Bible Society regarded Riggs as a suitable person to supervise the printing of the Bulgarian New Testament, and sent through Mr. Barker, its agent, the newly acquired manuscript to be issued there. At that time there was not a printing establishment in the whole of Bulgaria, and what few books had been printed in Slavic type for the people, had been issued in Servia or Wallachia. Mr. Barker provided Damian, the Greek printer of Smyrna, with a font of Slavic type, and thus created the first Bulgarian typography. Here were issued in 1838 and 1839 the Gospels and Acts, and in 1840 the complete New Testament. In 1839 there was, it is true, established a small printing office at Saloniki, but all the books that appeared there were in Old Slavic, or in a mixture of the old with the new idiom, whereas Smyrna became the seminary, however small its beginning, of Bulgarian learning. The first reviewer and censor of that nascent literature was Elias Riggs.

At first he had to restrict himself only to a general supervision of the works issued under his care, for his knowledge of the language was not sufficiently great to correct the translations; but even at that early period he stood for a national language based on the spoken form, following in this the natural tendency of all the missionaries of his time. Neophy whole himself was a Macedonian, and his translation of the New Testament was made in his native dialect. Considering his proneness to use Slavic forms in his previous works, which he published in 1835, it is fair to suppose that his manuscript of the Bible was not less free from them; but these have all disappeared in the printed book, no doubt at Riggs' suggestion or through his correction.

The latter insisted on a pure Bulgarian of the Western (Macedonian) type, since for a time to come he expected to confine his missionary efforts to the country this side of the Balcan mountains. The Gospels were frequently reprinted and were received by the people with the greatest enthusiasm, and for a period of two decades served as a model for the written idiom of the nation. Later, when culture penetrated into Bulgaria Proper, this abnormal state of raising a dialect spoken beyond the provinces of the country to the dignity of a literary language could not be maintained. When the Eastern dialect began to rise in importance, Riggs was among the first to adopt it for his translation of the whole Bible, but previous to the sixties, Neophytes' *New Testament* and Riggs' religious and ethical tracts formed the basis for all other literary productions.

Among the few Bulgarians who were settled at Smyrna, there was one who was in charge of a Lancasterian Greek school in which some Bulgarian was taught. This schoolteacher, by the name of Fotinov, was destined to become the founder of the first Bulgarian periodical. In 1894 the Bulgarians celebrated the fiftieth anniversary of this red letter year in the history of their intellectual awakening. Toasts were drunk, speeches made, and volumes written to commemorate the event. One of the country's most prominent scholars, Prof. Shishmanov, has since written an exhaustive treatise on the life and work of that Smyrna schoolmaster. In that unbiased essay the distinguished author is inclined to give the missionaries their due for playing an important part in Fotinov's evolution, but not having had access to the archives of the American Board of Commissioners of Foreign Missions, which contain all the correspondence of the missionaries sent out by that society, he has been led greatly to underrate that influence and to place the whole subject in a wrong perspective. In that article he says:

"There is, however, no doubt that the causes for that sudden development of Fotinov stand in some relation to the foundation of the Bulgarian printing office in Smyrna, and to the appearance of Neophytes' translation of the New Testament, printed there at the expense of the British and Foreign Bible Society.

From Mr. Riggs' reminiscences we learn the important fact that Fotinov had been engaged by Benjamin Barker, the Society's agent, to overlook the printing of the first edition. Since that edition came out in 1840, one may freely infer that Fotinov entered into an agreement with that agent soon after the appearance of Fotinov's Greek Grammar. It is difficult to say what influence this agent may have had on our writer and journalist, and in how far his issue of the 'Ljuboslovie' is connected with the history of the Protestant propaganda in our parts. One thing, however, is certain; considering Fotinov's weakness for Smyrna, he would never have realized his plans, if the British and Foreign Bible Society had not furnished A. Damian's printing office with Slavic type. There are besides a few more proofs that the Protestant missionaries helped Fotinov. Such are, for example, the illustrations in his Geography (and may be also in his 'Ljuboslovie'?) which had been furnished to him by the Society, as we learn from Mr. Riggs. But did the help of the Preachers of the Gospel stop there? I am inclined to answer in the affirmative, even though the later close relation of Fotinov with the missionaries, whose fruit is the first translation of the whole Bible, may lead the investigator to suppose a more active foreign influence on the original plan and edition of the first Bulgarian periodical. Against such a supposition speak the very contents of the Journal in which there is not the least trace of Protestant striving. On the contrary, there reigns in it, as we shall see, a purely Orthodox spirit, though free from all religious intolerance and narrow dogmatism."

With the aid of the documentary evidence spoken of above we shall attempt to reconstruct the facts in their chronological sequence. It will be remembered that long before the year 1840 Fotinov had been invited by the Bible Society to furnish a translation of the Gospels, and that it had been rejected as not written in pure Bulgarian. Fotinov was peculiarly obstinate on the subject of a literary language: he had himself been brought up in the traditions of the Greek school, and like the Greek schoolmen, regarded a return to the ancient language as the desideratum for a literary norm. By a similar reasoning the Church-Slavic, in the corrupted form in which it was known to him, seemed to him preferable to the quaint dialect of his native home. Only when he came under Riggs' control, he was induced to follow the precedent established by Neophytes' translation. This came about in

the following manner.

In 1841 Barker sent a few tracts of the American Tract Society to a pious Scotchman at Odessa; the latter had them translated by some Bulgarian students there, and sent them to Smyrna to be printed. Riggs employed Fotinov, the only educated Bulgarian within easy reach, to revise them with him. The following year there were issued two of them; *Friendly Counsels to Parents respecting the Training of Children*, and *The Tree of Intemperance and the Tree of Temperance*. Other two tracts: *Something for the Unlearned*, and Gallaudet's *Child's Book on the Soul*, Part I, were taken by Riggs to Constantinople and there revised by Ognianovich, a Servian, who had just established a native printing press, and had become an ardent Bulgarophil. The last two were printed in 1843 and 1844 respectively. All these tracts were highly treasured by the natives, and were used as textbooks for the study of Bulgarian in those Lancasterian schools that were fortunate enough to provide themselves with the same.

Through Riggs Fotinov became acquainted with the different American schoolbooks whose Greek translations were regarded as far superior to any other current at the time. The excellent cuts which accompanied them made them especially attractive, and threw in the shade all the native productions of the kind. No doubt Fotinov used them in his school. However it may be, he thought well enough of them to translate Woodbury's *Geography* into Bulgarian, and this was issued in 1842 from the Smyrna press. The success of the translation was phenomenal. Thirsting for knowledge, but possessing no reading matter, the Bulgarians welcomed that insignificant textbook with its American woodcuts, as one would to-day receive in America the latest work of a great novelist or a noted historian. It was the first book that conveyed to them the knowledge of the world without, and it filled their hearts with an unquenchable desire for learning.

In the same year Fotinov sent around a circular to solicit subscribers for a Bulgarian periodical. When the number had reached four hundred, he started in 1844 to publish his *Philology* (Ljuboslovie), which at once became

the rallying ground of the few intelligent men that the country could muster. In a letter of June 5, 1844, Riggs writes to the Secretary of the A. B. C. F. M.:

"I send you a specimen of the Bulgarian Monthly Magazine published here. It contains many articles (some of them religious) translated from our Greek Magazine. It is in fact a child of that work, without being sustained in any degree at our expense. This is one instance illustrative of the indirect influence of missionary exertions in these parts."

So, we see, this first periodical, from which dates the beginning of Bulgarian journalism and belles lettres, is "a child of an American Magazine,"—the direct result of Fotinov's acquaintance with Riggs. The few original articles that were written for that monthly by no means display any scholarship, but they for the first time dealt with Bulgarian matters and thus directed the attention of the people to their own country. Unfortunately Fotinov returned to his vagaries of a mixed Slavo-Bulgarian language, and this and the general poverty of his subscribers who would not, or could not, pay their dues, led to a cessation of the magazine in 1846. But the seed had been sown, and a rich crop has grown up in the last fifty years, so that now Bulgaria presents the unprecedented example of a nation rising to high culture from a state of crass ignorance within half a century.

## V.

With rare exceptions, the Bulgarians have entirely forgotten their early benefactors. This deplorable state of affairs is not so much due to their express desire to be ungrateful as to the unfortunate, self-abnegating practices of the missionaries, whose efforts were all the time directed in *majorem Dei gloriam* and who therefore failed to subscribe their names to their literary productions. In the sixties they produced an extensive anonymous literature by which, among other things, the alarming contagion of the Roman-Catholic propaganda was successfully checked, but it was possible to ascertain the name of the author of those pamphlets only by rummaging through the Archives of the Missionary Society at Boston. In the same manner, Elias Riggs did not attach his name to any of his own writings, and

entirely refrained from mentioning himself as the reviser of any of the early books that were issued at Smyrna or Constantinople. It is not, therefore, to be wondered at that even such liberal men as Shishmanov should be inclined to allot to the preachers at best an indirect influence in the awakening of the country, and to ascribe various Bulgarian books wrongly to native authorship.

That Riggs was well fitted to carry on the revision of the works printed under his care and to write in idiomatic Bulgarian, is attested by his scientific journey to Varna and his linguistic studies at Constantinople, of which he reports in a letter of November 16, 1843:

"When I wrote you last (June 7th) I was about leaving home for the annual meeting of our mission. I had then in mind a tour in Bulgaria and an absence of some months from home. I proposed to the brethren of the mission the matter of the journey and the whole question how I should spend my summer. As my health was not good, they advised me not to go into the interior of Bulgaria, but suggested that I might visit Varna, a Bulgarian town, but on the coast of the Black Sea, and which could be reached by a steamer, spend more or less time there as I might find expedient after seeing the place, and then return to Constantinople, where I could at all events find Bulgarians, make some inquiries, and revise the Bulgarian tracts we had on hand. In compliance with the suggestion, I left Constantinople for Varna July 10 and arrived there the following day. I spent only a week there, partly because I found that the Bulgarian language is spoken only by a few peasants from the neighboring villages and partly because the place is confessedly unhealthy . . . .

Returning therefore to Constantinople on the 17th, I immediately engaged the services of a Bulgarian teacher, and commenced revising for the press some tracts in that language which we have had on hand for several months. As my teacher lived at Arnaout-Köy, the village next below Bebek on the Bosphorus, at the invitation of Brother Wood, I took up my abode under his hospitable roof, and was accustomed to walk to Arnaout-Köy, spend an hour in revising, and return by about seven o'clock every morning. Except this hour, I gave the greater part of each day to miscellaneous employments, making health my first object, and entirely intermitting the work which I should have been engaged in at Smyrna. This I continued for six weeks, and during that time examined, and with the help of the teacher revised, one hundred and thirty-two pages of MS."

The fruit of his intimate acquaintance with the spoken idiom was his *Notes on the Grammar of the Bulgarian language*, a pamphlet of twenty-four pages, published in a small number of copies at Smyrna in 1844. This first attempt by a foreigner to establish rules for this Slavic tongue contains, in the short space just mentioned, all that is essential for practical purposes, and is based on the Macedonian dialect in which the author wrote up to the year 1859. Of this pamphlet there are a few copies in American libraries, but in Bulgaria it is entirely unknown, not being mentioned in any of the bibliographies. Nor is it generally known that the second grammar of the language written by a foreigner (Rev. F. C. Morse of St. Johnsbury, Vermont), and printed at Adrianople in 1859, which has not lost its value even to-day, owes not a few of its excellent features to suggestions by the author of the first treatise on the subject.

In the year 1851 began the agitation for the translation of the whole Bible into the vernacular, and soon after Fotinov was employed for the purpose of writing the same under Riggs' guidance. In 1857 there was brought out an edition of the Psalms. In the same year Riggs left for a two years' stay in the United States. Upon his return to Constantinople, to which place the mission had been removed in 1853, he resumed his labors with Fotinov, but the latter died a week later, and another collaborator had to be found. In the meanwhile great changes had taken place. Yielding to the urgent requests of Riggs, Hamlin, Schaufler and Richardson, the American missionaries at Constantinople, the Missionary Society had the year before established a station at Adrianople, and Riggs himself was, upon his return, sent on an inspection tour through Bulgaria for the purpose of deciding on other towns suitable for missions. In his long report, which is of great interest on account of its wealth of topographical notes, he dwells on the necessity of using the Eastern variety of speech, instead of the Macedonian, for all further publications, since from his inquiries among schoolteachers and other competent men, he had become convinced that the future belonged to that dialect. For the same reason he now engaged a native of Bulgaria

proper to aid him in the translation of the Old Testament (published in its entirety in 1872), and in other missionary publications.

With the establishment of the missions in Bulgaria there began a new period of American influence. Although the religious propaganda became the most prominent feature of their work, yet they continued furnishing the nation with translations of American schoolbooks, opened schools for them, and in 1864 began publishing the *Zornica*, an illustrated magazine, whose circulation was only second to the most popular native periodical, and in many other ways aided the country to free itself from the incubus of ignorance that had been lying heavily upon it for many centuries. In the meantime young Bulgaria was rapidly preparing itself to take the place of the foreign teachers and to agitate the intellectual and political independence of the country.

It is an interesting fact that when in 1876 Bulgaria had broken out in revolt against Turkey, it was an American who was most active in obtaining their political freedom. In an article by Mr. Geshov, the present minister of Finance in Bulgaria, published a year or two ago, and entitled *Memoirs of a Political Convict*, he points out that it was Eugene Schuyler, the American Minister to Turkey, who drafted the constitution for his country, and that it was through his efforts, and through his efforts alone, that it was accepted in its entirety at San Stefano, and he concludes his remarks by saying that had it not been for Schuyler, Bulgaria would not have been made free.

LEO WIENER.

*Harvard University.*

#### GERMANIC ETYMOLOGIES.

1. GOTH. *aha* 'mind,' *ahjan* 'believe,' *ahma* 'spirit,' O.H.G. *ahta* 'regard,' etc. According to Uhlenbeck, *Et. Wtb.*, s.v. *aha*, these words cannot be connected with the I.E. root *oq* 'to see,' because they show no labialization. In many of these forms the labialization regularly disappears (cf. Brugmann, *Grd.* i, 607), and from these generalization took place. Goth. *aha* may, therefore, be connected with the I.E. root *oq* without any difficulty.

2. Goth. *airus* 'messenger,' O.E. *ær*; and O.N. *erende*, O.S. *ärundi* have caused trouble on account of the ablaut *ai*: *a*, *ɛ*. The simple fact is, they should not be brought together. Goth. *airus*, O.E. *ær* is a noun of agency from the root *eik* 'go' (Brugmann, *Grd.* ii, 303); while O.N. *erende*, O.S. *ärundi*, 'errand,' with the ablaut *ær*: *ér*, belong to the root *ér* 'go,' 'hasten,' in Skt. *ar* 'hasten,' *arvant* 'hastening,' O.S. *aru* 'quick.' Cf. Persson, *Wz.*, 25.

3. Goth. *brunjō* 'breastplate,' if a genuine Germ. word, may be in formation a fem. abstract to the pres. part. of the root *bher* 'bear,' like *sunja* to the root *es* 'be.' The pre-Germ. form would be \**bhryftā-n*, meaning primarily 'something to be borne.'

4. Goth. *dulps* 'feast' is a fem. stem in -ti- to a root *d̄uel*, *dheul*. There are two possibilities. It may be the root, 'remain,' 'dwell,' in O.E. *dwelan*, and have come to its meaning just as Goth. *fastan* 'hold firm' and 'fast.' Or it may be the root 'cut' in Goth. *dulgs* 'guilt,' O.H.G. *tolg* 'wound.' (Cf. Ehrismann, *PBB.*, 20, 60). In the latter case it would go back to the meaning 'sacrifice.' The use of the word favors this view. It was evidently a religious feast, in Goth. especially the paschal feast.

5. Goth. *fastan* 'hold fast,' Skt. *pastyā*, I have for some time regarded as a compound of the root in *stō*, *stand*, but found no satisfactory connection for *pa-*. My friend, Mr. W. A. Wirtz, suggested that it might be the *pa* in *pascor*. This I believe is correct. The Germ. stem *fastu-* corresponds exactly with Lat. *pastus*, 'pasture.' The *s* of *pastus* is, therefore, not after the analogy of *pascor*, but is organic. The primary meaning of the word is 'feeding place,' which was the only abiding place of our nomadic ancestors.

6. Goth. *dauhts* 'feast' and *gadauka* 'household,' 'family' are both set down by Uhlenbeck as "unbekannten ursprungen." We may at least advance one step by connecting the two words. Goth. *dauhts* is, in formation, an abstract in -ti-, from the pre-Germ. stem \**dhukti-* < \**dhug-ti-*. The base of this, *dhug-*, also in *ga-dauka* from the stem \**dhougo-n*, probably meant 'eat' or 'taste.' So that *ga-dauka* meant primarily 'fellow-eater,' 'companion,' like *ga-hlaiba*.

Now this stem \*dhoygo- may be divided into root \*dhou-, \*dhey- and suffix -go-; and the root I believe to be the widespread I.E. root \*dhū-, which here has taken on the meaning of 'taste,' 'eat.' The same root is in Goth. dauns 'odor,' 'savor,' which is probably the intermediate step in the development to the meaning as seen in ga-dauka and dauhts.

7. Goth. *jah* 'and' is compared by Uhlenbeck with O.H.G. *ja* and *joh*. Other words mentioned in this connection are O.H.G. *jehen* 'acknowledge' and Gk. *η* 'indeed.' Cf. Kluge, s. v. *ja*.

Neither the comparisons nor the explanations are complete. Goth. *jah* cannot be directly connected with O.H.G. *joh*, nor with *ja*. In *jah* and in *joh* we have the I.E. enclitic -\*q<sub>2</sub>e, Skt. *ca*, Gk. *τι*, Lat. -que, as in Goth. *nih*, *naúh*, etc. But while Goth. *jah* goes back to I.E. \*ku-q<sub>2</sub>e, O.H.G. *joh* must be referred to \*ku-q<sub>2</sub>e. The first element in O.H.G. *joh* is, therefore, not the same as in Goth. *jah*, but is identical with Goth. *ju* 'already,' O.S., O.E. *ju*, *gio*, O.H.G. *ju*, *giu*.

The O.H.G. verb *jehan* may be directly compared with Goth. *jah*. The verb may contain an original ablaut, or may be of secondary formation. The latter is the more probable. For the verb must have been formed from the conjunction, and as this nowhere occurs in Germ. as \*jeh, the probabilities are that the ablaut of the verb is secondary.

As *jah* and *joh* cannot be directly combined, so Goth. *nih* and O.H.G. *noh* do not correspond. Goth. *nih*=Lat. *neque*, but O.H.G. *noh* represents I.E. \*nu-que. This divergence of the O.H.G. *noh* is explained by F. H. Fowler in his dissertation, *The Negatives of the I. E. Languages*, p. 31, as an assimilation to the particle *noh* 'yet,' on account of its use as an intensive with negatives. This assimilation was doubtless furthered by the corresponding affirmative particle *joh*.

8. Goth. *kuna-wida* 'fetter,' O.E. *cyne-wiððe*, O.H.G. *khuna-with*, *cuonio-widi*. "Das wort ist noch immer dunkel," says Uhlenbeck.

The last part is beyond a doubt connected, as is the supposition, with Goth. *ga-widan*, 'bind,' O.H.G. *wetan*, etc. The first element is the word 'knee.' The meaning of the compound is, therefore, 'knee-band.' In O.H.G.

*cuonio-widi* occurs the same ablaut as in Gk. *γωνία* 'corner,' Skt. *jānu* 'knee.' Both O.E. *cyne-* and O.H.G. *cuonio-* point back to an *i-* or *ka-* stem, and may be compared with Gk. *γωνία*. The ablaut in Goth. *kuna*, O.E. *cyne-*, O.H.G. *khuna*- comes from I.E. \*g<sub>2</sub>neio-, which is the same as is Goth. *kniu*<\*g<sub>2</sub>neuo-. The compound is formed similarly to Goth. *fōtubandi*.

9. Goth. *ga-nipnan* 'be sad,' and O.E. *genipan* 'get dark,' *genip* 'mist' are generally connected. The last word contains the root in a meaning nearest the original. It goes back to an I.E. root *nib*, which it is best to regard as an outgrowth of the root *en*, discussed in my article in the third number of the *Jour. of Germ. Phil.* The Gk. root *νιβ-* in *χέρνιβον* 'hand-basin,' *νιπτώ* 'wash the hands,' is supposed to come from I.E. *nigw*, on account of *νιζω*. Those who see no difficulty in the development of a Germ. labial from an I.E. velar might refer the Germ. root *nip* also to I.E. *nigw*. It is better, however, to regard these two roots as extensions of a simpler form *nek* 'flow' or 'be wet.'

The development in meaning is natural. O.E. *genip* 'mist' is not far from the root meaning. As mist causes darkness, we easily arrive at O.E. *genipan* 'get dark.' And 'be dark' readily passes into 'be sad,' as we see in Eng. *gloom*, *gloomy*, hence the final step to Goth. *ganipnan* 'be sad.'

10. Goth. *ga-tarnjan* 'estrangle,' 'separate' has not been connected with any other Germ. word, except ultimately with *gatairan*. The word, however, may be compared with O.H.G. *trinnan* 'withdraw,' 'depart,' *aba-trunnig* 'deserting,' *ant-trunnig* 'fugitive.' These are connected by Brugmann, *Grd.* ii, 970, with Skt. *dṝgāti*, from the root *der*. As O.H.G. *trinnu* comes from \*dr-*engō*, so Goth. *-tarnja* represents \*dr-*njō* or \*dor-*njō*.

11. Goth. *gup* 'god,' 'God.' Of the different derivations given for this word that proposed by Aufrecht, *BB.*, 20, 256, is the best, though the connection in meaning given there is certainly wrong. Skt. *juhōti* 'pour into the fire,' 'offer an oblation' gives us the clue to the development. The part. \*ghutō- 'offered,' 'poured out as an oblation,' applied to the object of reverence, would come to signify

'worshiped,' and then the object of worship, the deity. Cf. also Skt. *hōtar-* 'priest,' the counterpart to *\*ghutō-* the one worshiped by the oblation.

12. Goth. *hlaiw* 'grave' is usually referred to the root *kleik* 'lean,' and compared with Lat. *clivus* 'hill.' It is better, I think, to connect it with the root *kel* 'cover,' 'conceal' in O.H.G. *helan*, Lat. *celō*. Words meaning 'hill' formed from the root *kleik* uniformly denote a 'slope' or 'incline,' and not a 'mound' or 'elevation.' A grave, no matter how high a mound might be made, would not be regarded as a 'slope' or 'hill-side,' though it might be regarded as an 'elevation,' as in Lat. *tumulus*. In O. H. G. *grab*, O. Sl. *grobu*, 'grave,' the original idea was 'excavation.' Other Germ. words for 'bury' mean also 'cover,' 'conceal,' as Goth. *filhan*, O. E. *byrgan* 'bury,' *beorgan* 'protect,' both from the (root meaning) 'cover,' which is still in mod. Germ. *verbergen*. Goth. *hlaiw*, in all probability, had a similar development. To the same root belong also Goth. *hleipra*, *hlija* 'tent,' O.E. *hlid* 'lid,' 'cover.'

These words and all related to them have, in my opinion, developed directly from the meaning 'cover.' I believe, however, that the roots *kleik* 'cover' and *kleik* 'lean,' which are extensions of *kel* 'cover' and *kel* 'lean,' are ultimately identical, the latter being the original meaning.

13. Goth. *ib-* in *ib-dalja* 'descent; ' *ib- uks* 'going backward; ' O.E. *ebba* 'ebb,' etc., is probably the same particle as the *if-* in Goth. *if-huma* ('next following'), which has been compared with Gk. *ēnē* 'upon.' In form this is a locative to a stem *\*ep-* or *\*epe-*, meaning 'base' or 'down.' The same element is possibly in I.E. *\*p̥ed*, *\*p̥od* 'foot,' and in Gk. *πέδον* 'ground,' and other related words.

14. Goth. *hwōpan* 'to boast,' for which, so far as I know, no etymon has been found, is undoubtedly connected with *af-hwapjan* 'choke, quench,' *af-hwapnan* 'become extinguished,' M. H. G. *ver-wepfen* 'turn' (of wine). There is apparently no logical connection between the two sets of meanings, and it was outside of Germ. that I first found a cognate for *hwōpan*. This I saw in Lith. *kvēpti* 'breathe,' *kvāpas* 'smoke,' Gk. *καπνός* 'smoke,'

Lat. *vapor*. Goth. *hwōpan* meant, therefore, primarily 'blow, fume, vapor,' and came to signify 'boast,' just as did Eng. *blow, vapor*, and corresponding words in other languages. Goth. *af-hwapjan* was simply 'to blow out' or 'smother as with smoke.' With this word the connection with Lat. *vapor*, etc., has already been made. Compare Uhlenbeck, *Et. Wb.* s. v., *ashwapjan*.

We have in this group of words the ablaut *quēp- quōp-, quap-*. The ablaut in Goth. *hwōpan* may be secondary, from an original *\*hwēpan*: *hwai-hwōp*. The final *-p* is not what we should expect from the *p* of Gk., Lat., and Lith. The Goth. may go back to the pre-Germ. *quēb-* or perhaps rather to *quēpn-*, *quəpn-*, as in Gk. *καπνός*. Cf. Streitberg, *Urg. Gr.* §127. So I should prefer to explain it.

With a similar meaning occurs the root *quē-s-, quə-s-* in O. Bul. *kvasiti* 'fermentare,' O.N. *huæsa* 'hiss,' (id. ib. p. 112). In meaning M.H.G. *ver-wepfen* is more closely related to O. Bul. *kvasitan* than to Goth. *af-hwapjan*. The simplex *wepfen* would be exactly synonymous. Similarity of meaning, however, proves nothing of itself, but does in this case show that on that score there is no ground for separating the roots *quē-p-* and *quē-s-*. If then we admit a root *quē-* which by the addition of different determinatives gives various compound roots, we may also refer to this root Goth. *hwapjan* 'to foam,' and, with Uhlenbeck, connect it with Skt. *kvāthati* 'seethe,' which is explained differently by Brugmann, *Grd.* 12, 790.

15. O.H.G. *hwelf*, O.E. *hwelp*, O.N. *huelpr*, O. Sw. *hwälper*, *hwalper*, 'whelp,' from pre-Germ. *\*qzel-bo-*, *\*qzol-bo-*, come from a root *qzel* 'yell,' 'sound.' The same root with a prefixed *s* occurs in Gk. *συλλαξ* 'whelp,' Norw. *skvaldra* 'bark incessantly,' Lith. *skalikas* 'hunting dog that barks continually,' Čech. *skoliti* 'yelp,' (cf. Brugmann, *Grd.* 12, 595.) Compare further O.N. *huellr* 'loud sounding,' Mod. Sw. *skwella* 'resound,' Eng. *squall, squeal*.

This is not the same root as *kel* 'sound,' though one root has undoubtedly been contaminated by the other, and it is difficult to refer many of the words to their proper source. To *s-qzel* probably belong O. N. *skoll*

'laughter,' *skal, skual* 'chattering.'

16. Goth. *swarts* 'swart,' 'black' from \*s-*gor-do-* contains the root *uer-* 'cover,' which passes into 'befoul' as in Lat. *sordidus*, and 'black' as in the Goth. Cf. Skt. *var-na* 'color,' 'complexion,' which contains the root *uer-*. With the suf. -*dha-*, M.H.G. *swarte*, etc. See *schwarze* in Kluge's *Et. Wtb.* These words belong to the root *uer-*, discussed in *Jour. Germ. Phil.*, no. 3.

17. Gothic *bi-sauljan* represents the 'schwundstufe' of the root *yel-*, with a prefixed *s-* as in *swarts*. The *s-* in these words is due to some such word as Goth. *smeitan* 'smear.' The development in meaning is the same as in *swarts*. The root *yel-* had also the meaning 'cover,' a development of the meaning 'enfold,' 'wrap.'

18. Goth. *swaran* 'swear,' O. N. *svara* 'answer' has in it the root *uer-* 'speak,' in *wauards* and its cognates. The *s* here is due to the initial of words like, *say, speak*. The root *uer-* 'speak,' 'answer' is the same as *uer-* 'turn.' Observe that Skt. *varna* means 'outside,' 'color,' 'complexion' and 'sound,' 'word.' There must also be some relation between this word and *svára* 'sound.' (Cf. Uhlenbeck, *Et. Wtb.* s. v. *swaran*, where the contrary is assumed.) On the development of meaning from 'turn' to 'answer,' compare Eng. *return, reply, retort*, etc.

19. The root *kley-* 'hear' is referred by Brugmann to an unfound root *käl-*. This is connected doubtfully by Prellwitz in his *Et. Wtb.* with the root *kel-* 'sound;' about this there can be no doubt. The root *kley-* itself means 'sound' as well as 'hear.' O.N. *hlymr* 'noise;' O.E. *hléopor* 'sound,' 'voice,' *hlyðan* 'sound;' M. H. G. *lüt* 'sound;' and O.E. *hlud* 'loud,' Gk. *κλυτός* 'renowned' come as easily from the meaning 'sounding,' 'sounded,' as from 'heard.' In Lith. *gerdas* 'shout,' 'cry;' *girdziū* 'hear' we find a parallel. And the probabilities are that all words meaning 'hear' come from a root meaning 'sound'; for the proethnic man could have no idea of hearing except as a sound or noise.

The simpler root *kel-* occurs in Gk. *κέλαθος* 'noise,' (cf. Prellwitz) O. H. G. *hellan* and *s-cellān* 'resound,' *ga-hel* 'clear-sounding,' *holōn, halōn* 'call,' Lat. *calare*, Gr. *καλέω*,

and their numerous cognates. No further proof of this connection is needed.

Goth. *hausjan* 'hear' may also be referred to a root meaning 'sound.' Such a root occurs in Skt. *kāuti* 'he shouts,' Lith. *kaukti* 'howl,' Gk. *κακύω* 'cry,' 'shriek.' (Cf. Prellwitz, s. v. *κυδάζω*.) Compare also, for meaning, Skt. *gōsati* 'sounds:' Av. *gush* 'hear.'

FRANCIS A. WOOD.

Cornell College.

#### AMERICAN-FRENCH DIALECT COMPARISON.

*Two Acadian-French Dialects compared with "Some Specimens of a Canadian-French Dialect Spoken in Maine."*

##### PAPER NO. II.\* C.

- W.: æn bél fam=une belle<sup>83</sup> femme.  
See phrase no. 31, note 47.  
67. C.: òn bél fam=une belle<sup>83</sup> femme.  
CC.: òn bél fam=" " "  
W.: lò è króz=the water is deep=l'eau est creuse.  
68. C.: lò è króz=l'eau est creuse.<sup>84</sup>  
CC.: lò è króz=" " "  
W.: òn<sup>85</sup> è fè=un enfant.  
69. C.: ñen è fè<sup>86</sup>=" " "  
CC.: ñen è fè<sup>86</sup>=" " "  
W.: sèz<sup>87</sup>òmlâ sô fu=ces hommes-là sont fous.  
70. C.: sèz<sup>87</sup>òmlâ sô fu=ces hommes-là sont fous.  
CC.: sèz<sup>87</sup>umlâ sô fu=ces hommes-là sont fous.  
W.: sôñè=son nez.  
71. C.: sôñé=son nez.  
CC.: sôñé=" "

\* Paper No. I appeared in MOD. LANG. NOTES for December, 1893, January and February, 1894; and part of Paper No. II in December, 1897, and January, 1898.

<sup>83</sup> A form corresponding to Fr. *gentille*, I have not found in use in any of the localities I have studied.

<sup>84</sup> A form corresponding to Fr. *profonde* is not in use.

<sup>85</sup> For other forms of the indefinite masculine article, see phrase no. 25 and also note 40.

<sup>86</sup> The dialect form for Fr. *an* or *en* is nearer *æ* than *a*; as a rule it appears to me to be *ǣ*. Cf. phrase no. 27 and see note 42.

- W.: la pli=la pluie.  
 72. C.: là püi<sup>87</sup>=la pluie.  
 CC.: là püi<sup>87</sup>=“ “  
 W.: sèz yö<sup>88</sup>=ses yeux. Cf. no. 37.  
 73. C.: sèz yö= “ “  
 CC.: sèz yö= “ “  
 W.: pòrt=porte.  
 74. C.: pòrt<sup>89</sup>= “  
 CC.: pòrt<sup>89</sup>= “  
 W.: nu=nous.  
 75. C.: nu=nous, but not as subject for which *ð*=Fr. *on* with third pers. sing. is used.  
 CC.: nu=nous, but not as subject for which *z* or *ž*=Fr. *je* with the verb in the first pers. plural.  
 W.: twègo=toi. Cf. no. 14.  
 76. C.: twàgo, 91=toi.  
 CC.: twàgo, 91= “  
 W.: vu=vous. Cf. no. 92.  
 77. C.: vu91=“  
 CC.: vu91=“  
 W.: vâtë (or vð=?)=va-t'en.  
 78. C.: v<sup>86</sup>åtë<sup>86</sup>= “  
 CC.: v<sup>86</sup>åtë<sup>86</sup>= “  
 W.: tædbæ=perhaps=peut-être bien.  
 The *d* was not very distinct.  
 79. C.: ptètbæ<sup>94</sup> and tèt bæ=peut-être bien.  
 Cf. Passy's tsé pa =Fr. *je ne sais*

<sup>87</sup> The *l* of Fr. *pluie* is completely lost; parallel with this is dialect *pü*=Fr. *plus*; cf. *kökü* in phrase no. 17.

<sup>88</sup> See the comment on dialect *ðs*=Fr. *y* in note 54 referring to this phrase, no. 73.

<sup>89</sup> The *ø* is the same here as in French; a noticeable feature, however, of these two dialects is that in words where the *r* is final or followed by a silent consonant, the dialect *ø* is then not the Fr. *ø* in the French word *or*, that is, mid-back-wide-round, but mid-back-narrow-round as in Fr. *beau*; thus, dialect *tir*=Fr. *tort*, sounds exactly like Eng. *tore* (the past of *to tear*).

<sup>90</sup> Cf. again in regard to dialect *wè* and *wd* the Remark under note 103 of Paper no. 1—(referred to before in notes 16 and 26 of this paper). *twi* is heard a good deal,—see the note no. 91 below, where a remark by the school teacher, Mlle. Allard, gives an idea of the difference in usage of *twi* and *vu* as observed by her.

<sup>91</sup> Mlle. Allard says: "Les Canadiens se tutoient plus que les Acadiens. En général, les parents canadiens se font tutoyer par leurs enfants, ce qui est très-rare chez les Acadiens. Les Canadiens du Nouveau Brunswick, de la Nouvelle Ecosse et du Cap-Breton se tutoient généralement, excepté l'époux et l'épouse qui, quoique se tutoyant avant leur mariage se disent *vous* lorsqu'ils sont mariés."

- pas. Étude, p. 123.  
 CC.: tèt bæ=peut-être bien.  
 W.: savapa bæ=ça (ne<sup>92</sup>) va pas bien.  
 80. C.: sà vâ pâ bæ=ça (ne<sup>92</sup>) va pas bien.  
 CC.: sà vâ pâ bæ= “ “ “ “ “  
 W.: bókubæ=beaucoup bien.  
 81. C.: 93bukubæ<sup>94</sup>=“ “  
 CC.: bókubæ<sup>94</sup>= “ “  
 W.: sàvõ=savon (probably).  
 82. C.: sàvõ<sup>95</sup>=“  
 CC.: sàvõ<sup>95</sup>=“  
 W.: livü=I saw him and also I saw her=?  
 83. C.:<sup>96</sup> =  
 CC.: žlvü<sup>97</sup>=je levis.  
 W.: à vâ vnir=she is going to come==elle va venir.  
 84. C.: à vâ<sup>98</sup> mnir=elle va venir.  
 CC.: à vâ vnir= “ “ “  
 W.: la vla<sup>99</sup> (sometimes nearly vla<sup>99</sup>) ki vyæ=la voilà qui vient. <sup>50</sup>(For exception to tñ=Fr. *k*.)  
 85. C.: lâvlâ<sup>99</sup> ki vyæ\*=la voilà qui vient.  
 CC.: lâ vla<sup>99</sup> tñ vyæ\*=“ “ “ “  
 W.: is<sup>7</sup> dèn=he is giving=il donne. See no. 12.  
 86. C.: is<sup>7</sup> dòn=il donne.  
 CC.: is<sup>7</sup> dun=“ “  
 W.: i ètaprèdèn=il est après donner.  
 See. no. 13.  
 87. C.: i (or) il é aprè dòné.

<sup>92</sup> Just as a form corresponding to Fr. *ne* is lacking in the dialects, so *ne* itself is disappearing in popular French.

<sup>93</sup> The form *buku* is apparently due to the influence of the last syllable on the first. It generally replaces Fr. *très* before an adjective; for example, *bukù bon*=Fr. *beaucoup bonne*, that is, *très-bonne*.

<sup>94</sup> *bæ* is the form in use for the Fr. adverb *bien*; *bî* (see note 72)=Fr. *bien* in the sense of the noun, *goods* or *property*.

<sup>95</sup> As remarked in note 86, dialect *ðs* to my ear as a rule represented Fr. *an* or *en*; so, too, the dialect form for Fr. *on* sounded like *ð* or *ðs*, difficult to distinguish which; cf. the Parisian pronunciation of Fr. *an* or *en* with Fr. *on*.

<sup>96</sup> An exact equivalent to the CC. *ž l vü*=Fr. *je le vis* is lacking as there is no preterite tense in the dialect.

<sup>97</sup> Evidently analogy of the past participle.

<sup>98</sup> Influence of the *n* in nasalizing the Fr. *v* so that the sound is as written *mnir*. Cf. Passy's *amnii*=Fr. *avenue* and *re-uni*: *r*=Fr. *ravenir*. Étude, §434.

\* Conjugated with *aw*. *r*=Fr. *avoir*.

- CC.: A like form of expression not in use.
- W.: fō99 kə lièzōt tüt dədlā (kə or a very short k, l in lièz very faint, də or d̥ with very short ə)=I must take them all out of there=faut que (je? les?) ôte tou(te?)s de delà.
88. C.: fō99 kə liéz ôt tud də lâ=faut que je les ôte tou(te?)s de delâ.
- CC.: fō99 kə liéz ut tu də lâ=faut que je les ôte tou(te?)s de delâ.
- W.: té<sup>100</sup> fu (not t̥; but cf. no 91.)=you are a fool=tu es fou.
89. C.: té<sup>100</sup> fu=tu es fou.
- CC.: tē<sup>100</sup> fu=" "
- W.: zooté fōl=tu es folle.
90. C.: zooté fōl=" "
- CC.: zooté fōl=" "
- W.: tē<sup>101</sup> tōfū=you are a fool=tu es un fou.
91. C.: té fū<sup>102</sup>, 15=tu es un fou.
- CC.: tē æ fū<sup>102</sup>, 15=" "
- W.: vuzètfu=vous êtes fou.
92. C.: vuzètfu=" "
- CC.: vuzètfu=" "
- W.: téfū kōm æ māš a balèt<sup>103</sup>=you are a fool like a broomstick, tu es fou comme un manche à balai.
93. C.: té fū kōm æ māš (māh) à balè=you are a fool like a broomstick, tu es fou comme un manche à balai.
- CC.: tē fū kōm æ māš à bälè=you are a fool like a broomstick, tu es fou comme un manche à balai.
- W.: i fē frēt<sup>104</sup>=it is cold=il fait froid.
94. C.: iſt fē frēt<sup>104</sup>=it is cold=il fait froid.
- CC.: iſt fē frēt<sup>104</sup>=" " " " "
- W.: i fē ſō=it is warm=il fait chaud.
95. C.: iſt fē ſō=il fait chaud.
- <sup>99</sup> Cf. with examples from popular French given by Passy in his *Étude*, §271.
- <sup>100</sup> Popular French, Beyer und Passy, §91.
- <sup>101</sup> Analogy of forms where a t̥ may be heard, as in the third pers. sing. See note 23.
- <sup>102</sup> In lists of words where a final t̥ is sounded in the dialects representing words where in French under like conditions no t̥ is heard, my notes go to show that the feature is more common in Canadian than in Acadian French; see note no. 59, Paper No. I. Professor Squair records the Ste. Anne pronunciation of Fr. *balai*, no. 4 in list (5) of his *Contribution*, which if I might interpret it phonetically would be about like *halai* or *bala*.
- CC.: iſt fē ſō=" " " "
- W.: i bwē<sup>105</sup>=he is drinking=il boit.
96. C.: i bwā<sup>105</sup>=il boit.
- CC.: i bwā<sup>105</sup>=" "
- W.: truvé=to find=trouver.
97. C.: truvé=trouver.
- CC.: truvé=" "
- W.: ma6o vā ékrir=I am going to write=moi vais écrire.
98. C.: z<sup>103</sup> mā ékrir=je vais écrire.
- CC.: z vā ékrir=" " "
- W.: sōn étāb è grād=his stable is large. Cf. no. 10; son étable est grande.
99. C.: sōn étāb<sup>104</sup> è grād=son étable est grande.
- CC.: sōn étāb è grād=son étable est grande.
- W.: la lwē<sup>106</sup>=the law, la loi.
100. C.: là lwā<sup>106</sup>=la loi.
- CC.: là lwā<sup>106</sup>=" "
- W.: æ pyé\*=a foot, un pied.
101. C.: æ pyé=un pied.
- CC.: æ pyé=" "
- W.: ò pōdzōm=some men=un peu des hommes.
102. C.: æ pōdōm (rare); kēkōm kyōkōm (far com- moner)=quelques hommes.
- CC.: æ pō dum=un peu d'hommes.
- W.: pupwā=father=papa.
103. C.: pāpā=papa.
- CC.: pēpā<sup>105</sup>=papa.
- W.: lē<sup>107</sup> möbl=walls of the room (?)=les meubles.
104. C.: lē<sup>107</sup> möb=les meubles.
- CC.: lē<sup>107</sup> möb=" "
- W.: nwēr<sup>108</sup>=black=noir.
105. C.: nwēr<sup>108</sup>=noir.
- <sup>103</sup> mā=Fr. va here seems to be used on the analogy of such expressions as no. 44: z mā b*alier*=Fr. *je vais balier*, in which the m can be accounted for as in note 64.
- <sup>104</sup> Both grād (gr. k) and étāb are in use; there is however no form corresponding to Fr. *écurie*.
- <sup>105</sup> Weakening of the vowel of the unaccented syllable; see Passy, *Étude*, §313.
- \* As in no. 51 dialect pidži represents Fr. *pays*, a form pidži might be looked for representing Fr. *pied*. Cf. also phrases nos. 133 and 134 where one might rather look for fidži than fig.

CC.: <i>nwérē</i> = "	115. C.: <i>ön rēn</i> =une reine. CC.: <i>ön rēn</i> = " "
W.: <i>ænʒō mèzō</i> =a house=une maison.	W.: <i>æn wèzō</i> =a bird=un oiseau.
106. C.: <i>ön mèzō</i> =une maison, CC.: <i>ön mèzō</i> = " "	116. C.: <i>æ wézō<sup>109</sup></i> =un oiseau. CC.: <i>æ ózō<sup>109</sup></i> = " "
W.: <i>ænʒōs̄ēl</i> =a ladder=une échelle.	W.: <i>æsmæ</i> =a road=un chemin.
107. C.: <i>önésēl</i> =une échelle. CC.: <i>önésēl</i> = " "	117. C.: <i>æsmā<sup>110</sup></i> and <i>šmæ</i> =un chemin. CC.: <i>æsmā<sup>110</sup></i> " <i>šmæ</i> = " "
W.: <i>ænʒō plas</i> ( <i>or plas?</i> )=a place=une place.	W.: <i>æ</i> (or <i>ë</i> ) <i>kandō<sup>102</sup></i> =a boat=un canot.
108. C.: <i>ön plas</i> <sup>62</sup> =une place. CC.: <i>ön plas</i> = " "	118. C.: <i>æ kánō</i> =un canot. CC.: <i>æ kánō</i> = " "
W.: <i>lōn</i> (with a short vowel)=moon=lune.	W.: <i>flōr</i> =fleur.
109. C.: <i>lün</i> =lune (the <i>ü</i> is very short†) and the effect similar to <i>lōn</i> .	119. C.: <i>flōr<sup>111</sup></i> =fleur. CC.: <i>flōr</i> = "
CC.: <i>lün</i> =lune (the <i>ü</i> is very short†) and the effect similar to <i>lōn</i> .	The cardinal numerals 1-20, 100; W.: <i>æ, dō, twā, kat</i> ( <i>katz<sup>81</sup>dm</i> =Fr. quatre hommes), <i>sæk, sis, sét, üit, nöff, džis, öz, dūz, trēz, katōrz, tšēz</i> (not <i>tsšēz</i> ), <i>sēz, džissēt, dzizüt, džiznöff, vā; sā</i> , (or perhaps better <i>sē</i> ).
W.: <i>sa vwē</i> =his voice=sa voix.	C.: <i>ö, æ, dō(z),<sup>112</sup> trwa(z), trwā(z), kat(r)(z<sup>81</sup>), sæk(z<sup>81</sup>), sæk, si(z), sis, sē(z<sup>81</sup>), sét, üit(z<sup>81</sup>)(t), üit, nö(z<sup>81</sup>)(v), nöf, di(z), dis, öz, duz, trēz, trēz, katōrz, kyēz, sēz, di sē(z<sup>81</sup>), di sét, dizüi(z<sup>81</sup>)(t), dizüit, diznöf(z<sup>81</sup>)(v), diznöf, vā(z<sup>81</sup>)(t) sæk(z) (but sā ö or æ).</i>
110. C.: <i>sā wa<sup>106</sup></i> =sa voix. CC.: <i>sā wā<sup>106</sup></i> = " "	CC.: <i>ö, æ, yōn, dō(z<sup>112</sup>)dōs, trwa(z), trwas, kat(z), sæk(k); si(z), sis, sē(z), sét, üi(z), ult, nö(z), nöf, di(z), dis, öz,</i>
W.: <i>æ šyē</i> =a dog=un chien.	
111. C.: <i>æ syā<sup>72</sup></i> and <i>syē</i> =un chien. CC.: <i>æ syā<sup>72</sup></i> = " "	
W.: <i>æ šā</i> (or rather <i>šā</i> )=a cat=un chat.	
112. C.: <i>æ šā<sup>107</sup></i> =un chat. CC.: <i>æ šā<sup>107</sup></i> = " "	
W.: <i>dē šā</i> =des chats.	
113. C.: <i>dē<sup>42</sup> šā</i> = " " CC.: <i>dē<sup>42</sup> žā</i> = " "	
W.: <i>æ rwē</i>	
114. C.: <i>æ rwa.<sup>108</sup></i> CC.: <i>æ rwā.</i>	
W.: <i>æn rēn</i> =a queen=une reine.	

† Corblet in his *Glossaire Picard* gives *leune* on *lēne*.

106 This is merely a bilabial for a lip-tooth consonant; cf. phrase no. 8; a pronunciation which occurs also in popular French as mentioned in note no. 94 of Paper No. I.

107 Feminine *òn lēt*=Fr. une chatte.

108 As a rule in Carleton as in Cheticamp, a final French *a* is represented in the dialect by *ä*. For Carleton, in the following words both *a* (a rather than *ä*) and *ö* are heard, *a* by the young and *ö* by the old: *trwa* and *trwā*=Fr. *trois*; *bwa* and *bwā*=Fr. *bois*, Eng. *wood*; *mwa* and *mwā*=Fr. *mois*, Eng. *month*; *pwā* and *pwā*<sup>9</sup>=Fr. *pōz*, Eng. *pea*; *pwā* and *pwā*<sup>2</sup>=Fr. *pōds*, Eng. *weight*. Most other dialect words with the ending corresponding to Fr. *oi*, like *mwa*=Fr. *moi* and *twa*=Fr. *toi*, have, as a rule, only *a*. This points to something similar to what Beyer in his *Französische Phonetik*, p. 20, comments on; that is, that the modern tendency in popular French is to bring open and closed *a* together.

109 In Carleton and Cheticamp the rule is that *wē* corresponds to Fr. *oi*, when the *oi* is not final. There are, however, a few cases of *wē* instead of *wē* as in Carleton *wēs̄* while Cheticamp *zō*=Fr. *oiseau* is irregular. See the *Remark* † under note no. 103, Paper No. I.

110 Cf. note 72. I recorded a number of cases of dialect *ä*=Fr. *in*, but could establish no exact rule.

111 *flōr* is used continually for a form corresponding to Fr. *farine*, Eng. *flour* and in this sense appears to be an Anglicism. In Carleton and Cheticamp the dialect ending corresponding to Fr. *-eur* is apt to be closed, that is, the *ö* in Fr. *pen* rather than the *ö* in Fr. *peur*.

112 The forms enclosed in parentheses are heard before vowels; those ending in a vowel before consonants, or when there is no form ending in a consonant, as final as in *d̄*, *trwa*; those ending in a consonant may appear as final or where that is the only form as in *dūz*, *tr̄z*, etc., before both vowels and consonants. The form for Fr. *cent* is hardly distinguishable from that for Fr. *cinq* when before consonants.

duz, trèz, kàtòrz, tšèz, sèz, disè(z),  
disèt, dizüi(z), dizült, diznö(z),  
diznöf, vâ(z)(t), sâ(z).

## SUPPLEMENT.\*

- W.: zé<sup>113</sup> bædz ami=I have many friends [=j'ai bien des amis].
121. C.: žé bë<sup>114</sup> déz àmi=j'ai bien des amis.  
CC.: žé bë déz àmi=" " " "
- W.: han é tšö·kö=I have some [=j'en ai quelqu(es) uns. I doubt the correctness of the accent, and think the last letter should be ö].
122. C.: žänéköökö=j'en ai quelqu(es) uns.  
CC.: žänétsökö=" " " "
- W.: han é débå=I have some stockings [=j'en ai des bas].
123. C.: zé dé bå=j'ai des bas; (not said as above in Waterville with *an* or *ä*=Fr. *en*).  
CC.: zé dé bå=j'ai des bas; (not said as above in Waterville with *an* or *ä*=Fr. *en*.)
- W.: hé<sup>113</sup> dé kutó=I have some knives [=j'ai des couteaux].
124. C.: žé (hé) dé kutó=j'ai des couteaux.  
CC.: žé dé kutó=" " "
- W.: hané=I have some [=j'en ai].
125. C.: žäné<sup>112</sup>=j'en ai.  
CC.: žäné=" " "
- W.: žé<sup>113</sup> tå šæpó=I have many hats [=j'ai tant de chapeaux].
126. C.: žé tå dsæpó=j'ai tant de chapeaux (not said without *d* or *dɔ*).  
CC.: zé tå dšæpó=j'ai tant de chapeaux (not said without *d* or *dɔ*).
- W.: hé<sup>113</sup> šó=I am warm [=j'ai chaud].
127. C.: žé (hé) šó=j'ai chaud.  
CC.: žé šó.
- \* Professor Sheldon continues: "As a supplement I can now add some additional specimens taken from the pronunciation of M. J. (-dž), the mother of L. L., and written in a phonetic spelling essentially the same as that employed above. They were written at my suggestion by an inexperienced observer not familiar with spoken French. He writes ö for both ö and ø. I add in brackets remarks of my own.—M. J. was born in Cornville, Maine, cannot read nor write, is forty-nine years old, has always lived in Maine, except a year and a half in Canada after being married."
- <sup>112</sup> An expression much used here is žänélmas—Fr. *j'en ai en masse*, meaning *biancouf*.
- W.: héswi=I am thirsty [=j'ai soif. The sign i=English i in (*hit*), (*pin*), etc.].
128. C.: zé (hé) hé<sup>116</sup> swèf.  
CC.: zé<sup>116</sup> swèf.
- W.: hé<sup>113</sup> få=I am hungry=j'ai faim.
129. C.: žé (hé) hé få<sup>110, 72</sup> (rather than fæ).  
CC.: žé få<sup>110, 72</sup> (fæ).
- W.: pupå<sup>114</sup> bå=papa is good [=papa est bon].
130. C.: pápå é bô=papa est bon.  
CC.: pápåos è bô=" " "
- W.: pupå<sup>114</sup> grå=papa is tall [=papa est grand].
131. C.: pápå é grå=papa est grand.  
CC.: pápåos è grå=" " "
- W.: må gæ:så<sup>114</sup> épptsi=my son is small [=mon garçon est petit].
132. C.: mó gærsö é pti<sup>119</sup>=mon garçon est petit.  
CC.: mó gærsö è pti<sup>119</sup>=mon garçon est petit.
- W.: ma fig<sup>115</sup> é bél=my daughter is handsome [=ma fille est belle].
133. C.: mà fiy é bél=ma fille est belle.  
CC.: mà fiy è bél=" " " "
- W.: no fig<sup>115</sup> vièn=our daughters are coming [=nos filles viennent].
134. C.: nó fiy vièn=nos filles viennent.  
CC.: nó fiy vənō<sup>116</sup>=nos filles viennent.
- W.: mu'ma løyu dö grō:rå=mamma saw two big rats (grō:rå in her dialect means either rats or big rats) [=mamam? deux gros rats. I doubt the correctness of the accent in mu'ma, and the last letter in the same word should perhaps be ä. In *løyu*, I think *y* should be u].
135. C.: mémå å vu dö grō:rå (Cf., however, note 6o)=maman a vu deux gros rats.

<sup>113</sup> Cf. this /—Fr. / with that recorded in nos. 4 and 5, 6 and 7, (which is è).

<sup>114</sup> Cf. this /—Fr. / with that recorded in nos. 1, 2, 50, 87 and 99.

<sup>115</sup> Cf. with nos. 35, 36, 37 and 38 where Fr. y (consonant) —dialect dš. See also the \* under note 105.

<sup>116</sup> What is said in the important note 41 applies to this case.

CC.: məmā à vü dö' grō rā=maman a vu  
deux gros rats.

W.: "'Father' in her dialect is the same  
as in standard French, or perhaps  
the first *e* is pronounced more like  
*ie* in the modern French '*pierre*'."

136. C.: pér=père.

CC.: pér= "

W.: "I don't think I have given all the  
various ways for 'I have' in the  
dialect. I will not say positively,  
but . . . it seems as if she said  
something like *ȝfē* or *hwfē* for 'I  
have.'"

137. C.: žé, hé hé.

CC.: zé.

JAMES GEDDES, JR.

Boston University.

fining himself in the main to an elementary presentation of Early West Saxon. In the elaboration of this scheme he has been remarkably successful. Mr. Wyatt is a thorough scholar in Old English—as his edition of *Bēowulf* has sufficiently shown—and though he naturally follows the steps of Sweet, Sievers, and Cosijn, he proves himself to be an independent philologist. The didactic talent of the author appears on every page. His methods of arrangement, classification, and formulation of rules are not absolutely new. Every intelligent teacher of Old English has no doubt, in a great many cases, resorted to the same practical devices as Mr. Wyatt. But it is very convenient to have them put together, in a clear, concise form. To enumerate the 'innovations' in detail is unnecessary. Suffice it to call attention to some general features, and to mention just a few particulars which invite comment.

The text book does not pretend to be a complete grammar. "It would have given a specious air of completeness to the book to have added a section dealing with Old English syntax; but I am strongly of opinion that for the present such aid is best given in notes on selected texts." (*Preface*, page v). There are two principal parts: the first dealing with Inflection, the second with Phonology; besides we find, on the first seven pages, a condensed list of the chief paradigms, and in an Appendix a few sections on Word-Formation. The exposition of the sound-laws is especially well done; we note in particular the stress laid on the chronology of the different O. E. phonetic changes. Praiseworthy is the author's effort in combating inaccurate popular statements of linguistic phenomena (cf. § 119; § 68, n. i).

The statement that the O. E. diphthongs have the stress on the first element (§ 4; cf. § 141) needs modification,—at least if we consider the comparative fulness of information generally presented in this 'elementary' grammar.—If *hwilc*, *swilc*, *min*, *ðin*, etc., are given a place among the adjectives which are always strong (§ 41), such as *eall*, *sum*, etc., should not be omitted. From the curious note that *ān*=one, has always the strong form, and *āna*=alone, always the weak form, we might

WHEN this latest grammar of Old English fell into our hands, we felt tempted to exclaim with Ymagynatyf in *Piers the Plowman*: "þere ar bokes ynowe!" Elementary Old English Grammars as well as Readers and Exercise Books, have kept coming thick and fast for a number of years. Besides, the publication of two new books is being looked forward to with keen interest; namely, the revised edition of Sievers' *Grammar*, and Bülbings' *Elementarbuch* in Streitberg's series. And now the list is swelled by another number. It is true that in the mother country of the Anglo-Saxon speech there have been so far no signs of a possible overproduction in this line; and the enthusiastic activity of America does not appear to concern the author of this new grammar. Anyhow, no one could well be supposed nowadays to enter upon such a task, unless he were sure of his case.

Mr. Wyatt's plan was to combine in his manual the merits of Sievers' 'Germanic' and Sweet's 'independent' method, whilst con-

be led to conclude that *āna* has nothing whatever to do with *ān*.—Has the vowel length in *ōfost* (§ 108) and *ēstan* (§ 128) been proved?—*getrēow* (§ 112) should be *getrēowe* (*getriewe*); in § 126 we find *getrīewe*.—In the chronological table of sound-changes (§ 115), shortening appears in the first place. The only two examples given, \**līht* and *bētwīh* (§ 162), may justify this arrangement, but the reader should beware of inferring from those instances a general rule of early shortening. Further, the influence of following *w* is, indeed, posterior to i-umlaut in *mēowle*; but *nīewe* (Sievers, § 73, 2), *fēawe* (§ 73, 1) certainly point to an earlier period. In these cases the student will do well to bear in mind Mr. Wyatt's words that some of these processes "must have been in operation over a considerable period of time."—The criticism of Sievers in § 145, n. loses its point by the fact that (1.) Sievers himself is guilty of no inconsistency in the use of the term 'Palatal Umlaut' in his Grammar (see the original German edition, §§ 85 and 102), and (2.) in his *Abriss* (1895), § 5, the name is employed in the narrower sense only.—The remark that the loss of *h* in *ðyrel* is preceded by i-umlaut and by breaking (§ 159), seems to be due to an oversight.

The following misprints have been noticed: p. 1, last word: *lāru* for *lārum*; § 33, n. 3, l. 5; and *in hēre* for *as in hēre*, § 40, 3; *mīere* for *mīere*; § 54, n. 2: *feorðe* for *feorðe*; § 174: *onlietan* for *onlietan*, cf. § 126; the omission of the diacritical hook under the *e* or *o* in: *dēhter* § 37; *āsecgan* § 60, d; *cweallan*, § 64, e; *swēre*, *swēriað*, etc., § 80, and n. 5; *sēnde*, *send* § 83, n. 6; *nēmde*, *nēmnode*, § 88, 5; *gesēnded*, § 89, 1 b; *secge*, § 93; *gongan*, § 96, n. 4; *ēlne*, § 171, 3; *forswērian*, § 174; *wēbbestre*, *wēdlāc*, § 175.

It is easily seen that every new elementary book is bound to be, in a certain way, an improvement upon its predecessors. Wyatt's grammar deserves, in our judgment, to be ranked among the very best introductions to the study of Old English, whether we look at it from the scientific or from the practical point of view.

FREDERICK KLAEBER.

*University of Minnesota.*

#### SPANISH LITERATURE.

*La Isla Bárbara* and *La Guarda Cuidadosa*, two comedias by Miguel Sanchez (El Divino), edited by HUGO A. RENNERT, Ph. D.—Publications of the University of Pennsylvania, Series in Philology, Literature, and Archeology, Vol. v. Boston: Ginn & Co., 1896. 8vo, pp. xx, 297.

LA présente étude a été lue à l'École des Hautes-Études, à la conférence d'espagnol de M. Alfred Morel-Fatio, comme un des travaux de l'année scolaire 1896-'97.

Dans cette édition, M. Rennert nous donne deux comédies dont l'une, *La Isla Bárbara*, est beaucoup moins connue que l'autre: c'est sur celle-ci que nous avons concentré notre attention. Disons tout d'abord que M. Rennert aurait pu faciliter de beaucoup la lecture et l'étude du texte en l'imprimant de façon à indiquer clairement les formes de versification employées par le poète, comme l'a fait M. Mérimée dans son édition de *Las Mocedades del Cid*, et comme le fait M. Menéndez Pelayo dans son édition du théâtre de Lope de Vega.

Dans l'introduction qui est bien faite, M. Rennert insiste en particulier sur un fait déjà signalé par M. Baist, comme il le dit du reste, à savoir que notre poète n'est pas un successeur du grand Lope de Vega, mais au contraire un de ses prédecesseurs. Aux passages cités par M. Baist, M. Rennert en ajoute d'autres encore tirés des écrivains contemporains, lesquels, me semble-t-il, mettent ce point hors de doute. A propos de l'un de ces passages, celui qui est tiré de l'*Arte Nuevo de Hacer Comedias* de Lope de Vega, il est à remarquer que M. Rennert semble ne l'avoir pas complètement compris. Nous insérons à ce sujet la note suivante que nous devons à M. Morel-Fatio.

M. Rennert n'a pas bien interprété le passage de l'*Arte nuevo* qui se rapporte à Miguel Sanchez; il a confondu l'*engañar con la verdad*, procédé que Lope signale comme ayant été employé par Sanchez "dans toutes ses comédies," avec le *hablar equívoco* dont Lope parle ensuite en général et sans application à Sanchez.

Voici le passage de l'*Arte nuevo*:

1. El engañar con la verdad es cosa  
Que ha parecido bien, como lo usava  
En todas sus comedias Miguel Sanchez,

2. Digno por la invencion desta memoria.  
Siempre el *hablar equivoco* ha tenido  
Y aquella incertidumbre anfibologica  
Gran lugar en el vulgo, porque piensa  
Que el solo entiende lo que el otro dice.

Là-dessus, M. Rennert écrit : "This, freely translated, means : 'Speeches with a double meaning—literally, to deceive with the truth, i. e. to tell the truth, but in such a way that it will be misunderstood—always have a good effect, as Miguel Sanchez, worthy of memory on account of this invention, has used them in all his plays,' because, he continues, 'the spectator thinks that he alone understands what the actor is saying.'"

Il n'est nullement question dans le premier passage, le seul relatif à Sanchez, de "Speeches with a double meaning;" il est question uniquement de l'*engaño con la verdad*. Pour comprendre le sens de cette expression, il faut se souvenir qu'un des principaux artifices des auteurs de *comedias* consistait dans la "suspension de l'intérêt." Il ne fallait pas que le public fut averti trop tôt du dénouement de l'action; aussi l'auteur cherchait-il par tous les moyens possibles à ne pas le laisser entrevoir; il s'appliquait à "tromper l'attente des auditeurs." Lope le dit lui-même très explicitement (*Arte nuevo*):

En el acto primero ponga el caso,  
En el segundo enlace los sucesos  
De suerte que hasta el medio del tercero  
Apenas juzgue nadie en lo que para.  
*Engaño siempre el gusto y donde vea*  
Que se dexa entender alguna cosa,  
De muy lexos, de aquello que promete.

*Engañar el gusto*, dissimuler l'issue de la pièce en trompant le spectateur, tel était le procédé habituel. Miguel Sanchez eut l'idée d'inventer quelquechose de nouveau. Ayant affaire à un public qui s'était accoutumé à être trompé, qui s'attendait toujours à quelque dénouement imprévu et ne répondant pas aux données du premier et du second acte, il s'imagina lui de le *tromper avec la vérité*, c'est à dire d'annoncer ce que serait le dénouement. Le public ne le croyait pas, et il obtenait ainsi le même résultat que ses émules: il trompait comme eux les spectateurs, mais il trompait en disant vrai. Le procédé, comme on le voit, n'a rien de commun avec le *hablar equivoco* dont il est parlé après. J'ajoute que l'*engaño con la verdad*, qui, d'après Lope, caractériserait "toutes les comédies" de Sanchez, n'apparaît, à mon avis, ni dans la *Isla Bárbara*, ni dans la *Guarda Cuidadosa*.

Quant au texte, il est souvent incompréhensible, comme le dit M. Rennert. Mais la ponctuation aurait pu être considérablement améliorée, et souvent il nous semble que la meilleure leçon a été mise dans les variantes. Nous nous permettrons, donc, d'indiquer les corrections suivantes.

- v. 14. *Permite, ya*  
21. Substituer la variante au texte.  
33 ss. Il faut ajouter, après v. 32, et comme v. 33, le vers qui suit 32 dans le ms.; et omettre le vers 38 du texte, qui manque dans le ms. et n'a pas de raison d'être vu qu'il détruit le sens du passage. Avec le texte ainsi reconstitué, le sens est parfait. La rime indique qu'il faut substituer *afronta* à *ofensa* dans le vers 33 du ms., (correction suggérée par Mlle. E. Wallace, de l'Université de Chicago). Le texte donné est:  
31. [REV]—Es cuerdo, no se crea que se a puesto  
En cosa de que no saldrá muy presto.  
DOMICIO—En punto está que á aquel que le socorra  
Perdonará el agrabio por mi cuenta.  
35. REV—Que no, que será aacer con que se corra;  
¡Como es posible que tal pecho sienta  
Ynconveniente alguno? el nos aorra  
*Del temor, porque nada le amedrenta,*  
Con la buena opinion que dél tenemos  
De que en este peligro le ayudemos.

Nous proposons la leçon suivante:

31. [REV]—Es cuerdo, no se crea que se a puesto  
En cosa de que no saldrá muy presto.  
*Nadie se mueba ques aacerle afronta*<sup>1</sup>  
DOMICIO—En punto está que á aquel que le socorra  
Perdonar,i el agrabio por mi cuenta.  
35. REV—Que no, que será aacer con que se corra;  
¡Como es posible que tal pecho sienta  
Ynconveniente alguno? el nos aorra,  
Con la buena opinion que dél tenemos,  
De que en este peligro le ayudemos.

45. ymitas;  
46. digo;  
78. Le texte nous offre:

Mas como hombre do rraçon asiste;  
tandisque l'édition de Tortosa présente:

Mas como en hombre de razon consiste;  
De ces deux leçons qui sont toutes deux mauvaises, nous croyons que l'on peut en faire une bonne. Il n'est pas très difficile de voir en *en*, de l'édition de Tortosa, une faute, soit d'impression soit de copiste, pour *un*. Nous lisons donc:  
Mas como un hombre do rraçon asiste;  
Dans le texte adopté par M. Rennert le vers est trop court, à moins de

<sup>1</sup> ms. *ofensa*.

- faire hiatus entre *como* et *hombre*.
99. acuda  
104. espumosa,  
108. Substituer la variante.  
123. Substituer la variante.  
124. suerte que  
129. Lire *inquietud* au lieu de *quietud*.<sup>a</sup>  
215. Pues si,  
218. Substituer la variante. Omettre REV-Dime., et lire
- VITELIO—Dejame: arto e sido mudo:
237. La correction que nous donne ici M. Rennert est inutile. Le vers manque dans le ms., et l'édition de Tortosa offre une leçon très bonne et très idiomatique :
- REV. « Emilio, hay quien le de ropa ?
- La question est une manière d'imperatif déguisé, ce qui s'accorde tout à fait avec l'esprit du temps.
241. capa; y ven.  
243. Aqueste se rapporte à *vestido*, v. 242.  
247-8. Substituer les variantes.
- Y este me ayudó á librar  
De la pasada locura;
- Avec cette leçon on a un bon sens pour le passage 243-256, ce qui n'est guère possible avec le texte.
250. peso :  
260-1. Le passage n'est pas du tout clair, et, à la suite d'une longue discussion dans la classe, nous avons adopté, comme étant la moins mauvaise, la leçon suivante :  
DOMICIO. Vitelio, ¿ qué? Bueno está.  
¿ Lo pasado no os contenta ?
272. La variante nous paraît préférable, parcequ'elle exprime mieux l'incertitude qui règne dans l'esprit du roi, en reléguant la chose dans l'avenir.
290. Ici M. Rennert a probablement choisi la meilleure leçon. Mais la variante est intéressante comme spécimen du langage vulgaire. *Tablon*, dans le langage de la *Germania*, ou fraternité des voleurs—"table." *Banco*—le banc où les malfaiteurs étaient
- enchaînés pour ramer dans les galères: et ensuite, dans le langage de la *Germania*,—synonyme de "prison." La leçon provient sans doute d'une copie d'acteur.
- 377-8. . . . acordarte,  
*Que si*  
La virgule est nécessaire au sens, parceque le vers suivant n'est qu'une parenthèse, et le *si*, de 378, n'est pas le lat. *si*, mais le lat. *sic*.
388. ella,  
De 385 à 392 il n'y a qu'une phrase, assez compliquée à la vérité: *aunque* (385) se rapporte à *con todo aquesto* (389). Nous donnons ici la traduction littérale de la phrase.
- “Et quoique ce soit la vérité que le fait qu'elle est ma sœur (et cette seule raison) m'imposa l'obligation de la défendre, cependant mon honorable garde me forgait toujours de me rappeler qu'elle était ton épouse aussi bien que ma sœur.”
451. Cansarete  
472. Lire *Que su piedad*  
475. *embarcar*,  
510. Le vers est à corriger à l'aide du ms.  
509. EMILIO. . . . . *Pues luego*  
*Soy aquí.*
- VITELIO. . . . . *¿Qué importará?*
- Et Vitelio doit dire les deux vers suivants et les deux octaves: c'est à dire jusqu'au v. 528.
519. Substituer la variante.  
633. Fortuna,  
727. Substituer la variante.  
759. vengo;  
936. Substituer la variante.  
966. locos;  
967. Agora si,  
970. Substituer la variante.  
979. ¿ Que mi  
982-3. Que armas dejó el enemigo  
Con que socorra á mi amigo.
- 998-9. Substituer les variantes.  
1027. Substituer la variante.  
1037. sequeis  
1055. bajos  
1065. esta  
1081-2. Substituer les variantes.  
1098. vida,

<sup>a</sup> Correction de M. Morel-Fatio.<sup>3</sup> Suggestion de Mlle. E. Wallace.

1170. gusto ;  
 1173. La correction est inutile. T. donne une bonne leçon, qui est meilleure que celle du texte.  
 1230. Substituer la variante.  
 1246. Substituer la variante.  
 1251. parienta  
 1316. Substituer la variante.  
     ; Cuando le a visto la tierra ?  
 1324. concluya  
 1339. celos,  
 1340. llama ;  
     Il nous semble que *llama* devrait être considéré comme un impératif adressé à Nisida. Le passage est obscur.  
 1347. *La* se rapporte à l'idée qui est exprimée dans *razones*, v. 1345.  
 1348. Substituer la variante.  
 1366. Vers faux : substituer la variante.  
 1470. traemelé.  
 1510. vete.  
 1515. huerta  
 1516. Ve,  
 1526. Qué  
 1579. Anda, ve, que yo te fio  
 1637. entrambos  
 1709. ¿ Y porque  
 1712. hurtais ?  
 1762. vengaté  
 1826. Substituer la variante. Dans le texte, tel que nous le donne M. Rennert, le vers est trop court à moins de ne faire pas la synalèphe dans *si ha habido*. La leçon du ms. donne *si abido*, tandis que grammaticalement il faudrait *si a abido*. Mais cette omission de la forme personnelle du verbe ne devrait pas nous étonner, me semble-t-il, et on pourrait dire que le *a* initial de *abido* a absorbé le *a*, (3<sup>e</sup> p. sing. ind. prés.), et que nous avons ici un cas de "ἀπὸ κοινῷ εἶναι Lautes," suivant l'expression employée par M. Tobler au sujet d'un phénomène analogue d'anc.-fr., dans une note de la page 187 de ses *Vermischte Beiträge zur französischen Grammatik*, Band I.  
 1873. Substituer la variante.  
 1912. deseais,
1943. halles,  
 1944. obliga,  
 1968. Substituer la variante, parceque le vers est faux.  
 1989. Substituer la variante, à cause de la syntaxe.  
 1992. ella.  
 1993. Anda, Pulciano,  
 1996. agravio;  
 1998. responde;  
 2000. obligo ;  
 2001. amigo,  
 2002. Omettre *Que*, qui détruit à la fois le rythme et le sens.  
     Yo cobraré la muger.  
 2032. celo, como  
 2069. La correction de M. Rennert est inutile, vu que les leçons de T. et du ms. sont toutes les deux bonnes. Celle de T. nous paraît préférable.  
 2090. tierra ;  
 2147. Substituer la variante.  
 2149-50. Substituer les variantes.  
     ; Qué, aun ue yo de tener  
     La culpa ! . . . Yo me destruyo.  
 2164. contento.  
 2172. presto  
 2173. Substituer la variante. *Echar el resto*, terme de jeu—"risquer tout."  
     A echar en seguilla el resto.  
 2174. dolor ;  
 2175. perseguir,  
 2189. Lire *sinjusticia* (en un seul mot). C'est une recomposition populaire, faite parceque le peuple ne sentait plus la force de *in* comme préfixe négatif.  
 2201. ir ;  
     La variante est moins cacophonique.  
 2319. Dios,  
 2355. Que veut dire M. Rennert par ses remarques sur les variantes : "2355-2359 *wanting in M.*—2355. (*sic*) ; deso (?)?" M. Morel-Fatio a suggéré *desearía* pour *de se fia*. Dans le texte, le vers est faux. Il est à remarquer que tout le passage, 2355-2360, est très obscur.  
 2374. amparada  
 2387. quejas,

2416. corazon, fiera,  
 2455. La variante nous paraît préférable.  
 2476. encierra ;  
 2515. Hermana, decí *que* es esto ?  
 2608. defiendemé.  
 2609. escuchamé,  
 2615. Substituer la variante.  
 2616. No, traidor,  
 2621. presto ;  
 2622. Vamos,  
 2684. nombres.  
 2730. Exemple intéressant d'hendiadys dans *pudiera* : 3<sup>e</sup> personne avec *hablarme*; 1<sup>e</sup> personne avec *habllala*.  
 2775. Substituer *duda* à *deuda*. Littéralement "Dans un tel bien, le doute du bien excuse ma folie, car, etc."  
 2829. aportastes,  
 2855. sierra,  
 2868. demas.  
 2870. Ea, dama ! no acabamos ?  
 La première personne du pluriel remplace souvent la seconde du singulier, dans le langage très familier.  
 2886. La forme *pudistes*, 2<sup>e</sup> pers. du sing. du présent, est à remarquer. Il y en a plusieurs explications, mais la plus satisfaisante nous paraît celle-ci : à savoir, qu'elle s'est ajouté une *s* par influence analogique avec les autres formes de la 2<sup>e</sup> pers. du sing., lesquelles se terminent toutes en *s*.  
 2906. cuesta  
 2907. inhumana !  
 2908. salido  
 2910. hermana !  
 2935. Substituer la variante, à cause du jeu de mots que fait avec intention Troyla, feignant d'avoir mal entendu ce que disait Vitelio. La réponse de Vitelio (v. 2942) s'accorde avec cette leçon.  
 2968. perdónamé,  
 2976. Substituer *es te* à *este*.  
 2978. Miré  
 3010. ! Ya . . . . presto ?  
 3041-2. Substituer les variantes.  
 3053. Substituer les variantes.  
 3132. Grammaticalement il faudrait *venga*;

- mais la rime exige *vengo*.  
 3466. Contôle  
 3537. Substituer la variante.  
 | Tras de qué intentos me arrojo !  
 3701-2. TROYLA. Usamos aca esta guarda,  
 Vitelio. ! Qué se te da ?  
 3707. Substituer la variante.  
 : No te ha de conocer ?  
 3708. : Qué tienes ya que le digas ?  
 3787. sido,  
 3910. Y tú,  
 3935. Substituer la variante.  
 3996-8. C'est Vitelio qui devrait prononcer ces vers, et non pas Drusilo.  
 4033. desprecieis  
 4049-52. Malgré l'habitude qu'ont les auteurs espagnols de répéter le titre de la pièce dans les derniers vers du troisième acte, la leçon du ms. nous paraît préférable. Et quoique "*La Isla Bárbara*" ne soit pas nommée explicitement dans la leçon du ms., elle est toutefois suffisamment désignée.

La versification de cette comédie laisse beaucoup à désirer.—Je n'ai pas du tout essayé de relever tous les cas de cacophonie, mais on aura une idée de la fréquence de ce phénomène en considérant les vers: 1280, 1603, 1614, 1928, 2606, 2867, 2908, 2917, 2928, 2946, 3249, 3753.—Il semblerait aussi que la question de l'*f* lat. initiale, c'est à dire la question de savoir si elle permettait ou empêchait la synalèphe, dépendait absolument de la volonté du poète. Pour l'affirmative, voir les vers: 1311, 2115, 2116, 2867, 2872, 2900, 2915, 2944, 3249, 3284, 3353; pour la négative: 1268, 1594, 2836, 3762, 3766. Ces listes ne sont complètes ni l'une ni l'autre. Dans tous ces cas nous n'avons affaire qu'aux deux mots: *hacer* <*facere*> et *hallar* <*afflare*>, devenu par transposition <*\*fallare*>.

Les quelques remarques qu'on aura trouvées plus haut sur la comédie elle-même nous ont paru intéressantes. C'est pour cela que nous les avons insérées, bien qu'elles n'entrassent point dans le cadre que nous nous étions proposé pour ce travail.

JOHN D. FITZ-GERALD.  
*Columbia University.*

## FAUST.

*Historia D. Johannis Fausti des Zauberers nach der Wolfenbütteler handschrift nebst dem nachweis eines teils ihrer quellen herausgegeben von GUSTAV MILCHSACK. [Überlieferungen zur Litteratur, Geschichte und Kunst hrsg. v. Gustav Milchsack, Herzl. Bibliothekar in Wolfenbüttel. 2. Bd., 1. Teil. Wolfenbüttel: Verlag von Julius Zwissler, 1892-1897.]*

THIS book is at once a very noteworthy and a very aggravating contribution to our knowledge of the real nature of the *Faustsage*. Gustav Milchsack publishes herewith for the first time a manuscript of the *Faustbuch* discovered by him in the Wolfenbüttel ducal library. We are, however, left wholly in the dark as to the circumstances of the discovery and as to the present whereabouts of the manuscript. The editor does not even distinctly state, but leaves us to infer, that the version of the chap-book here presented is based, not upon a forgotten print, but upon a manuscript. With the single exception of a footnote, p. ccxc sq., suggested by a discussion of Lerchheimer's relation to the original of the *Faustbuch*, Milchsack offers no systematic attempt at showing the relation of the present version to that contained in the Frankfort edition of 1587. Instead of with critical apparatus for controlling the Wolfenbüttel manuscript in subsequent investigations, the Introduction is almost exclusively concerned with the question of the sources of the *Faustbuch*. Not even a hint do we find as to the intention of the editor to deal critically with the manuscript question in the second part of the work, or at any subsequent time. The very importance of the investigations chronicled in the editor's Introduction renders still more regrettable defects like those just mentioned.

However, we have good reason to be thankful to Milchsack for full information concerning other discoveries described in the aforesaid Introduction, and to these I wish to call especial attention.

A brief review of the cultural conditions that produced the *Faustbuch*, with emphasis upon the importance of the unknown author, almost the sole transmitter of the so-called *Faustsage* to subsequent generations, occupies the first fourteen pages of the book. Scherer's view (*Das älteste Faustbuch*, Berlin, 1884, s. xiv), that oral or written tradition concerning

Faust and possibly other magicians, whose personality has been merged by the Anonymous in that of Faust, is the broad substratum of the whole chap-book, Milchsack finds scarcely in accord with the extreme paucity of details touching the *Faustsage* outside of the *Faustbuch* itself (s. xv). That not even Widmann, whose collection of material followed closely upon 1587 and was prompted by a desire to surpass the performance of the Anonymous, presents us with any new points, not easily traceable to familiar literary sources, certainly does seem strange, if we still hold to the view that the Anonymous drew heavily upon a large stock of widely current gossip, oral and written, concerning Faust and his more or less similar prototypes.

Milchsack accords Ellinger full recognition for the implications of an article published by the latter under the title: *Zu den Quellen des Faustbuchs von 1587* (*Zs. f. vergl. Litt. Gesch.*, N. F., i, 156 ff., 1887, 88). Ellinger points out the opportunity afforded by the heterogeneous make-up of the chap-book for separating the various layers from each other and for resolving them into their constituent parts.

"Es ist Ellinger's unbestreitbares Verdienst, die Bahu dieser fruchtbaren Untersuchungen eröffnet zu haben durch den Hinweis auf das Faustische Rhodus, wo der Sprung aus dem ungewissen Zwielicht der Hypothesen auf den hellen Boden der Tatsachen gemacht werden muss: durch den Hinweis auf die Quellen" (p. xvii).

Ellinger's attempt to follow his own clue led him to a careful comparison of geographical and historical hand-books of the sixteenth century, with passages of the chap-book and the discovery of sundry striking resemblances, particularly in Sebastian Münster's *Mappe Europae*, Frankfurt a. M., 1536, and in the same author's *Cosmographei*, Basel, 1550, whose discussion is the substance of his article in the *Zs. f. vergl. Litt.-Gesch.*, N. F., p. 156 sq. His conviction of the existence of another as yet undiscovered source, common to the Anonymous and to various other hand-book writers of the sixteenth century, as Münster, Franck, Quad, Jobst, and Sauer (*Zs. f. vergl. Litt. Gesch.*, i, 158), doubtlessly proved quite as suggestive to Milchsack, as did the general theory, already quoted. Especially was this true in the light of Erich Schmidt's article (pub. first in the *Goethe-Jahrbuch III*, 1883, and later in *Charakteristiken*, p. 1 sq.), entitled *Faust und das 16. Jahrhundert*, in which

the author showed that the supernatural secrets of the chap-book stand in a droll anachronism with the cultural status of the latter part of the sixteenth century. Milchsack quotes Schmidt's words (*Charakteristiken*, p. 22):

"Der Autor hat den riesigen Fortschritt der Naturwissenschaften nicht mitgemacht, und so geschieht es, dass der Titan Faust, der seltsamerweise trotz Jahresgehalt und höllischer Kunst genötigt ist, in einer Zeit spöttischer Lasstafeln und Prognostica sein Leben als Horoskopsteller zu fristen, und sein Berater in wissenschaftlichen Dingen greulich verwahrlöst sind, dass über die Bedeutung des Sonnenstandes für Sommerwärme und Winterkälte ein Kapitlehen von belustigender Alberheit vorgetragen und alles Astronomische ohne eine Ahnung der Kopernikanischen Revolution vom Standpunkt vorsintflutlicher Anschauung aus abgehandelt wird,"

to support his own view that the nonsensical and incoherent revelations of Mephistopheles are a proof, not of the ignorance and incapacity of the Anonymous to grasp the *Faustage* in its breadth and depth, but of their mediæval or at least of their ante-Reformation origin (p. xix). It seems to me questionable whether Schmidt really meant what Milchsack attributes to him here. His quoted words are, at any rate, equally capable of another construction; namely, that the ignorance of the Anonymous was the occasion of his putting into the mouth of Mephistopheles such antediluvian philosophical and scientific views as the chap-book contains. However, the intention of Erich Schmidt in the premises is significant at this point merely as a stimulus to Milchsack, prompting him to search earlier records for the sources suspected by Ellinger to lie in the sixteenth century. Whether Milchsack read this into or out of the words of Schmidt is immaterial. To his mind the Anonymous, measured by the standards of his day, was at least a fairly well educated man, with some conception of the enlightenment of his age, who thought the aforesaid antediluvian views just strange and eerie enough to render a magician and practitioner of the black art impressive, not indeed to scholars like Tritheim, Mutian, Wier, and Lerchheimer, but to the naively credulous public for which he wrote (p. xix). In the absence of a strong creative imagination that would have enabled him to portray his hero as the central figure of some bold dream of the future, realizing the most daring hopes and speculations of his contem-

poraries, he conjures up the pale shades of the vanishing past, with which to charm or to terrify a less fastidious audience (p. xx). This interpretation of Erich Schmidt's conception of the problem is certainly original with Milchsack. At any rate, Ellinger seems to forget, while examining and comparing the hand-books of the sixteenth century, the wide discrepancy between the chap-book contents and the comparatively enlightened views of the Anonymous' own time. Similarly Szamatolski, who presents in his *Zu den Quellen des ältesten Faustbuchs (Vierteljahrsschrift für Literaturgeschichte*, i, 161 ff.) many striking parallels between the chap-book and *M. Elcidarius*, Frankfurt a. M., 1572, attaches little importance to the fact that the *Lucidarius* is a product of the twelfth century, that has been a favorite of the 'Messen' through a long series of reprints because of its encyclopædic substance (cf. p. xxii). Such reflections led Milchsack to search the hand-books of the fifteenth century for the source of the chap-book, suspected but not discovered by Ellinger.

In Hartmann Schedel's *Buch der Cronicken und gedächtnus wirdigern geschichten von anbegynn der werlt biss auf diese unsere zeit*, Nürnberg, 1493, he has hit upon what certainly seems the source in question. The theological, the astronomical, and the geographical-historical details of this encyclopædic work, whose subsequent editions and reprints are practically literal copies of the original of 1493, reappear in sundry parts of the chap-book with only slight deviations in form and substance. For example, the whole of the twenty-sixth chapter, the longest in the *Faustbuch*, which describes the travels of the hero, and the twenty-seventh chapter, *vom Paradeiss*, consist entirely of paragraphs and of smaller fragments of the *Cronick*, with slight or with no verbal variations, bound together by a slender thread of narrative, intended to furnish the necessary transitions from point to point. If we omit three oriental cities that head Schedel's list, and sundry European cities that the Anonymous does not mention at all, we find in *Cronick* and chap-book the same sequence of places, involving a very remarkable zig-zag journey pursued by Faust through twelve stations, beginning with *Trier* and including, besides, *Paris, Mainz, Neapel, Venedig, Padua, Rom, Mailand, Florenz, Lion, Köln, Aachen*, (p. xxv sq.). We must certainly agree with Milchsack (p. xxvi) that at this point no very

deep reflection was necessary to convince the chap-book author that a closer regard for details of continental geography would render travel easier, even for a man like Faust, seated upon a *Flügelross*, and would also reduce the demands upon the credulity of even a very naïve and superstitious audience. We are, therefore, not surprised to see him abandon at this juncture the sequence observed by Schedel, and proceed with some regularity eastward from *Aachen* to *Konstantinopel* and back again by way of *Memphis-Kairo* to *Erfurt* through a series of towns, all of which are described in the *Cronick*. In parallel columns (p. xxvi—p. ill [=xlviii]) Milchsack presents piece by piece the relation of the successive parts of the twenty-sixth chapter of the chap-book to their fifteenth century originals as contained in the *Cronick*. Here is the mysterious source of so much that is similar in the hand-books of Franck, Müns-ter, Jobst, Quad, Sauer, etc., (*Zs. f. vergl. Litt.-Gesch.*, i, 158), and its much closer correspondence with the *Faustbuch* makes inevitable the inference that it was in the hands of the Anonymous. The ease with which the latter transforms these geographical-statistical data of an ancient hand-book into the elements of a magic journey, is a staggering blow for our faith in the credibility of any part of the chap-book, and for our belief in the existence of any considerable body of oral or written Faust-tradition, to which Ellinger confidently refers as *unmittelbare Quellen* (*Zs. f.*

SCHEDEL'S *Cronick*, Bl. 3a:

Amm andern tag sprach got. Es werde das firmament in dem mittel der wasser: und tailte die wasser von wasseren und er hies das firmament den himel. Got hat das firmament gescheibelt, beweglich, andere emfintliche ding begreiffende gemacht, und auss zesam-mengerunnen wassern in gestalt des cristals befestigt, und darinn das angeheft gestirne.

No less interesting than this papable literary transfer of chapter 21 (cf. Milchsack, pp. lix, lx and lxi) is the somewhat more complicated situation in chapter 22: *Ein Disptatio und falsche antwort dess Geists Doctor Fausto gethon* (cf. pp. lxii, lxiii). Of especial importance is the appearance in Schedel's *Cronick* (Bl. 1a) of the passage embodying the doctrine urged by the Arabian philosopher, Averrhoës,

*vergl. Litt.-Gesch.*, i, 158). This is far removed from Scherer's theory (*das älteste Faustbuch*, p. xiv) of faithful transcription, occasional transference, and anecdotal decoration. This is wholesale literary piracy, backed by a certain fundamental shrewdness, and capacity for loosely linking together the items of the book and connecting them with the name and the person of the hero.

Chapter 27, with its eastward trip through lands quite likely selected by the Anonymous from the map in Schedel's *Cronick* (bl. 12b and 13a) and through places he had early noted in his original and reserved for later use,—names well calculated to suggest great remoteness,—brings us at length to the climax of Faust's earthly journeyings, to the Garden of Eden itself. A glance at the parallels presented on pages lv, lvi, lvii, shows that Schedel furnished substance and in some cases also verbal form of this, as of the preceding chapter. The slavish copying of geographical and historical details already noticed is presumptive evidence of similar procedure elsewhere in the chap-book. In three other places we find unmistakable evidence of a use of Schedel's *Cronick* like what we have already mentioned. The whole of the twenty-first chapter consists, save for a few introductory words of the anonymous, of a series of extracts from Schedel, with slight verbal modifications, well illustrated by the following parallel :

"Von dess Himmels Lauf, Zier und Ursprung"

FAUSTBUCH W. p. 43, 8:

... Dann Gott macht ansehnlich den Himmel auss dem mittel des wassers, unnd theilt die wasser vom wasser, unnd hiess das Firmament den hymmel. So ist der Himmel kuglicht oder Scheublich unnd beweglich. Auch ist der Himmel, der vom wasser erschaffen unnd zusammen gefüegt ist, so befestigt wie der Christall unnd sicht auch oben im Himmel also. Darinn ist angeheft das gestirn, etc.

(b. 1126, d. 1198), concerning the uncreated and eternal nature of the world and of mankind,—a passage, whose counterpart in the chap-book is, as Scherer says (*Das älteste Faustbuch*, p. xviii), one of the few places, where we rise above the measure of mediæval ignorance and half-education, characteristic of the work. Instead, however, of being one of those features of Faust-tradition not utterly

spoiled by the supposed incapacity of the Anonymous, it stands here revealed as a wretched plagiarism (p. lxiv). Schedel gives the Averrhoistic and also the Christian view side by side, apparently for completeness' sake:

[D] Jeweill bey den allergelertisten und fürnamsten mannen die die waren natur und geschicht beschriben haben vom geschopff der werlt, und von erster geburt der menschen zwayerlay wone ist. So wollen wir von disen vorderen zeiten: den anfang nemende auf das kürtzst schreiben: Sovil sich von sower (altershälben) entlegnen dingen gezimen wil. Etlich haben gemaint das die werlt ungeporn und unzerstörlich: und das menschlich geschlecht von ewigkeit her gewesen sey, und anfang einichs ursprungs mit gehabt hab. Etlich mainten die werlt geboren und zerstörlisch seyn, und sagten das die menschen anfang der gepurt genomen hetten.

The Anonymous' choice of the heathen view tallies with his desire to render his hero as Antichristian as possible (cf. lxvi). Schedel's mention of the Mosaic creation theory in the middle and towards the end of this chapter of the *Cronick* doubtlessly led the Anonymous into the well known discrepancy between the statement of Mephilstophiles as to the un-created nature of the world and of mankind and the same spirit's later utterance as to the creation of mankind and of the heavens at the hands of God. Szamatólski suspected (*Vierteljahrsschrift f. Litteraturgesch.* I, 180) compilation at this point because of the glaring contradiction just noticed, but was unable to indicate the source for obvious reasons. His appeal to Aventin's lengthy attempt in his Bavarian *Cronicle*, A. D. 1526, to refute the Averrhoistic theory as good proof of the wide currency of the latter in the sixteenth century, seems to me as devoid of cogency as it does to Milchsack (p. lxvi). Aventin's effort was far more likely prompted by his outraged religious feelings upon reading the doctrine in Schedel's *Cronick*. This would be morally certain, if an examination of the Bavarian *Chronicle* revealed frequent borrowings from Schedel.

Once launched upon the contradiction already emphasized, the chap-book author was naturally forced into the deviations from Schedel shown in the rest of the twenty-second chapter. There remain of this chapter the first fifteen lines, descriptive of Mephilstophiles approach to Faust, whom the spirit finds deeply depressed, for which no literary source has yet been discovered.

Another theological chapter, the third of the three places mentioned above, is the tenth, in the *Faustbuch: Question Doctoris Fausti mit seinem Geyst Mephilstophile* whose substance and, in part, whose wording is found in Schedel's *Cronick* (Bl. 6a, 2): *Von unterschied der himlischen ierarchey gewalt oder fürsten-thumb.*

The scope and nature of the parallels, cited in detail by Milchsack (pp. xxii-lxxiv), between the *Faustbuch* (chaps. 10, 21, 22, 26, 27), and Hartmann Schedel's handbook, are such as to show clearly the author's slavish dependence upon printed authority, and to cast a serious doubt upon the theory that the chap-book rests to any considerable extent upon oral or written Faust-tradition. We see the Anonymous here at work with shears and paste-pot, now condensing, now omitting, and again shuffling his clippings to adapt them more closely to the space and purpose of his *Roman*, and the more we see him do it the more incredulous we become, as to his own statement about the well-known *Faustsage*, whose mouth-piece he professed to be. Is this statement anything more than a rather clever didactic and commercial trick to increase the sale and influence of his ware?

Milchsack begins his discussion of *Mittelbare Quellen* (pp. lxxiv sq.) with a notice of what, as it seems to me, may prove to have been a direct source. A passage in Jacobus de Theramo's *Belial zu teutsch, etc., etc.*, Strassburg, 1508, corresponds closely with about one third of the fourteenth chapter of the *Faustbuch* concerning the efforts of the evil spirits to people Hell with the ensnared souls of men (W 29, 14-30, 9). Since, however, an earlier edition of the *Belial* (Reutlingen, 1472) presents several still more striking verbal resemblances to the chap-book than the Strassburg edition of 1508, while the latter more closely accords with the *Faustbuch* in two particulars, Milchsack does not claim to have found the direct source of the Anonymous. In the absence of a possible third edition of the *Belial* with none of the deviations just mentioned, that should tally in each instance with the chap-book, we cannot be sure that the work of de Theramo is the direct prototype of this part of the *Faustbuch*. As the matter now is, Milchsack is properly in doubt whether the hypothetical direct source copied *Belial*, or whether the latter is a copy of the former (p. lxxxix).

Less satisfactory than the foregoing is Milch-

sack's attempt (pp. lxxix-xc) to discover in Dionysius von Leeuwen's *Cordiale de quatuor novissimis et de particulari judicio et obitu singulorum*, Colonie, 1473, or a German abridgment of the same: *Tractatus quatuor novissimorum. Das sind die vier letzten ding*, etc., 1493, and in: *Ain schöne matteri Eingedailt in sibē tag der wochē und genant der sündigen sele spiegel*, etc., Ulm, 1487, the indirect sources of sundry passages of the chap-book, as for instance, parts of chapters sixteen (W 35, 33-36, 10, and W 37, 31-38, 34) and sixty-nine (W 116, 25-32). In spite of the parallelism here disclosed, these works prove scarcely more than that eschatological opinions of this stamp prevailed in theological books of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, wherefore it is superfluous to assume a *Faustsage* as their basis in the chap-book.

Pages xciii-ccxlii discuss the relation of Ludovicus Milichius' *Zauberteufel* (*Der Zauberteufel. Das ist von Zauberei, Warsagung, Beschwerung, Sagen, Aberglauben, Hexerei und mancherlei Wercken des Teufels*, etc., Frankfurt, a. M., 1563) to the *Faustbuch*. Sigmund Feyrabend's reprint of the work, Frankfurt, a. M., 1587, in his *Theatrum Diabolorum* and the existence of at least two further editions of the book, one at Frankfurt, a. M., 1564, and the other *ibidem*, 1566, are proofs of the wide circulation of the work. The tone of the treatise and the dedication of the author's only other known work, — *Schriften Teufel*, etc., Homburg (?), 1566; Frankfurt (?), 1567,—to the doughty Count Wolrad von Waldeck, of Protestant fame, show the theological leanings of Milichius. His work (*Zauberteufel*), a warning against evil and dangerous practices, answers the two questions: 1. What is Witchcraft? 2. What kinds of Witchcraft are there? Its thirty-eight chapters are not concerned with ultimate questions, like how? or why? The author's chapter head-lines (1. *Ob Zaubery sey.*—2. *Was Z. sey.*—6. *Dass alle Z. durch den Teufel werde aussgerichtet.*—7. *Von etlichen mitteln unnd Ceremonien zur Z. gehörig*, etc.), are ingeniously worded and adapted to catch the attention of the reader.

The preface of the Wolfenbüttel manuscript (W 5-9) shows unmistakably the substantial and also the verbal influence of the *Zauberteufel*. (Cf. Milchsack's parallel columns, pp. cvii, cviii, cix and cx). Definitions of *augurium*, *chiromantia*, etc., assume the same shape in the chap-book as in sundry parts of the

*Zauberteufel*; in the eighth chapter of the latter work we find the prototype of the deprecatory statement of the *Faustbuch* concerning the abuse of God's Words in incantations (p. cx); Milichius mentions the *Gespensten und Wunderzeichen, welche die Egyptischen [Zauberer] für dem König Pharaö thäten*, thus furnishing almost literally the model of W 8, 4 sq., not to speak of other allusions in Milichius to the arts of the Egyptian sorcerers. References in the *Zauberteufel* to Persia, as the original home of sorcery, to Hebrew words in incantations, and to the Chaldaeans, as celebrated exponents of occult sciences (pp. 99 sg. and 198), may easily account for the assertion of the Anonymous concerning Chaldaic, Hebrew and Persian *vocabula* as particularly potent agents of magic (W 8, 7 sq.). Again Milichius apparently furnishes the prose original (p. 52) of the rhymed saying in W 9, 15, 16. Upon these and other similar facts the argument rests that the author of the preface of the Wolfenbüttel Ms. had the *Zauberteufel* before him as he wrote. The question whether this author also wrote the manuscript itself, or whether he merely furnished an original Ms. that had no preface, with the preface in question, or whether the latter is merely a substitute for a preface that accompanied the original, differing from that of W and S, can only be decided after an exhaustive comparison of the extant versions has been made. Milchsack assumes the author of the *Vorrede* to be identical with that of the Ms. I shall later give reasons for regarding the *Vorrede* of W as older than that of S, and incidentally show why, as it seems to me, the editor of S found it necessary to write another preface.

In the twentieth chapter of his book, Milichius gives us under the caption *Vom Milchstelen*, a geographical and climatological explanation of the growth of summer fruits at some point during what passes for mid-winter at some other point, and ascribes to the extreme quickness of the Devil, that enables him similarly to manipulate stolen eggs, butter, and milk, the appearance of such fruits in winter at the pleasure of the wizard. Milchsack shows this to have been a current view of the matter in the sixteenth century (pp. cxviii sq.). Hence the chap-book author might have derived his chapter: *Abentheuer an des Grafen von Anhalt hoff getrieben* (W 86, 1 sq.) from Hermann Hamelmann: *Der Teufel selbs*, etc., Frankf. a. M. 1568 (?), or from some other hand-book,

save for his tendency, already observed in case of Schedel's *Cronick*, to continue the use of the same source as long as it proved fruitful. Milichius furnishes at any rate the essence of the passages in question. Place, time, persons, and situation seem to be the invention of the Anonymous. Even the kernel furnished by Milichius shows development under the influence of the *Elucidarius*. Milchsack quotes two passages from the twelfth chapter of this work that contain questions of the pupil and replies of the master, as to the cause of the seasons of the year and of the change from day to night (W 87, 1-7 and 87, 9-12). Thus he corroborates the contention of Szamatolski as to the use of the work on the part of the Anonymous. Szamatolski showed in his article already quoted the dependence of the *Faustbuch* chapter *Vom Donner* (W 74, 14 sq.) upon the fifteenth chapter of the *Elucidarius*. Milchsack recognizes the cogency of this argument, but finds in the chap-book author's use of the words: *Kiseln, das Gewölck an den Ort treiben* (lacking in the *Elucidarius*) evidence of his knowledge and use of the *Zaubertensel* even here; especially in view of Milichius' further statement, p. 208: *Er macht die blitzen im regen, und lässt den wind kommen auss heymlichen orten* (Enden). Professor Victor Michels (cf. *Deutsche Litteraturzeitung*, xviii, 43, column 1668), in his attempt to reduce this argument to its lowest terms, overlooks entirely the passage of Milichius, just cited, as well as the Anonymous' derivation from Milichius' statement that the clouds can come *auss den Mitternächtigen landen, odder auch auss sonst nahen orten* of the chap-book conclusion that *oftt umb Mittag ain Gewitter dahier kombt ye im Aufgang, Nidergang unnd Mitternacht* (W 75, 3 sq.).

The salient features of the conjuring scene, that is 1. place, 2. ceremonies, 3. number of times the formula is repeated, and 4. the time of the occurrence are furnished by Milichius. The cross-roads (W 12, 30), the magic circles (W 12, 31 sq.; 13, 9, 11, 18, 23; 14, 3), the triple conjuring (W 13, 30 sq.), and the time of the occurrence (*gegen Abent*, W 12, 30, or, more definitely, *inn der Nacht zu Neun unnd Zehen Uhr*, W 13, 2, and with indication of extent, *biss umb Zwelff uhr inn die Nacht hinein*, W 14, 4 sq.) all find their counterparts in Milichius, p. 61, 63, 62, 59, respectively. The most important of all, the formula itself, we find nowhere in the chap-book, notwithstanding

the brave flourish of allusion to Greek, Latin, Hebrew, Chaldaic, Persian, and Arabic vocables, figures, characters, incantations, and to necromantical books (W 11, 31 sq. and W 24, 24). In view of this, Milichius' omission of the formula from conscientious scruples, lest the weak and the inquisitive be tempted to a wicked use of it, if given, is significant (cf. Milchsack, p. iC.). The omission can certainly not be accidental in case of the Anonymous and, judged by the zeal of the author in making the adventures and person of Faust both interesting and terrifying, it is not withheld because of moral compunctions. The conclusion is, therefore, that the Anonymous did not give the formula for the simple reason that he did not know it. (Cf. p. cxxxii.)

I can see only a fanciful connection between Mephistopheles' appearance to Faust as a fiery shooting star, that changes gradually into a ball of fire and finally into a gray monk (W 13, 17 sq.), and Milichius' discussion of genuine and of false diabolical appearances (pp. 88 sq. and 134). More probable to my mind than this is the theory, later adopted by Milchsack and discussed by him at length (pp. ccclvii sq.), that Luther's anecdote *Tischreden*, Erl. ed. 60, 28) of the Devil who "a Monk would be" and who really became one under the condition imposed by the brethren that he adopt their garb and ring a little bell (schelle, glöcklin) whenever he approached, is, along with the Protestant Anonymous' identification of the Catholic Monk with the Devil himself, the occasion of the Gray Monk's appearance in the chap-book. This view also explains Faust's desire to marry, and the Monk-Devil's rabid objection to it, far more acceptably than the current consideration that marriage is ordained of God and hence hateful to the Devil.

Milichius speaks repeatedly of Simon Magus as the magician since the time of the apostles, and plainly has him in mind when enumerating the acts within the range and power of a *Schwarzkünstler* (cf. Milichius: chaps. v, vi, xiii, xiv, xvi). His quotation of the Clementine *Recognitiones* in their bearing upon the life and career of Simon Magus, is an earnest of his great interest in the character and deeds of this object of the allusion contained in the eighth chap. of the Acts of the Apostles. Here then we have: a. the author of a *Zauberroman*, provided but scantily with oral and written tradition as basis, ransacking old handbooks and treatises (cf. researches of Ellinger,

Szamatolski, Hartmann, Bauer, Stuckenberger, Meyer, Milchsack, etc.), for material and for suggestions for a plot; *b.* evidence of acquaintance with and drafts upon the substance and form of the *Zauberteufel*, and, *c.* the inevitable selection of Simon Magus as conceived and portrayed by Milichius as lay-figure for the hero, Faust. Milichius tells us (p. 48) of the boasts of Simon Magus: *a.* ability to render himself invisible; *b.* power to pass through solid obstacles; *c.* safe flight from lofty points; *d.* power to free himself and bind his keepers; *e.* power to cause prison doors to open spontaneously, to allow escape; *f.* power to endow inert objects with life; *g.* power to cause sudden growth of plants and trees; *h.* power to resist effects of fire; *i.* power to render himself unrecognizable by facial transformation; *j.* power to turn into a sheep or goat; *k.* can cause beards to grow upon the faces of boys; *l.* can fly like a bird; *m.* can produce gold in abundance; *n.* can appoint and depose kings; *o.* can cause himself to be revered as a deity.

What are some of the accomplishments of Faust? He becomes invisible in presence of the Pope (W 59, 11) and at the Bavarian wedding (W 80, 30; frees himself and others from imprisonment (W 90, 10); causes the sudden growth of a garden (W 104, 1 sq.); assumes the appearance of Mahomet (W 66, 24); furnishes the students on Ash Wednesday with donkey heads (W 93, 9); rides through the air on a sort of Pegasus (Flügelross) (W 56, 28), in a dragon-car (W 53, 23), and also on the folds of his mantle (W 80, 19); in place of heathen images he brings to life the Emperor Alexander (W 76, 7) and Grecian Helen (W 94, 6). In spirit and in detail we note a substantial resemblance between the magic experiments of Simon Magus and those of the chap-book Faust. This was long ago recognized by E. Sommer and de la Garde. Recently Th. Zahn (*Cyprian von Antiochien und die deutsche Faustsage*, Erlangen, 1882) urged that, in view of such striking resemblances, the *Simonsage* is the direct prototype (*Stammvater*) of the *Faustsage*. Kuno Fischer's objections to this claim (*Goethes Faust I*, Stuttgart, 1893, pp. 44 sq.), typical of a whole class of similar criticism, were cogent as long as no tangible connection between the two figures could be shown. Now Milchsack shows in his whole argument: 1. that the so-called *Faustsage* is the basis of the chap-book in no such important sense as all his predecessors have

tacitly assumed or explicitly claimed; that is, that the Anonymous wrote an independent *Roman*, selecting material and, in part, phraseology from printed German books, wherever he found what seemed adapted to his purpose, and 2. that in Milichius' *Zauberteufel*, from which the author of the Wolfenbüttel Ms. unquestionably borrowed many substantial and partly also verbal features, Simon Magus is repeatedly alluded to as Arch-Magician. From this he infers that the resemblance between Simon and Faust is not accidental but intentional,—resting not upon oral or written tradition, but upon the literary workmanship of the chap-book author (cf. pp. cxxxv sq.). Attentive study of the details of this argument convinces me of the soundness of Milchsack's reasoning and conclusion.

Zahn and other scholars have frequently traced the gnostic conception of the inherent, creative wisdom of the deified Simon (*die Kraft Gottes, die da gross ist*)—the *Ennoia*—later made concrete by identification with Athene, especially with the Homeric Helena, just as Zeus was transferred at times to the figure of Simon. Thus the connection with the Homeric myth was early effected and, in spite of the protests of the Church Fathers (cf. Epiphanius, Haer. xxi, 3), never forgotten. The efforts of the church were, however, successful in fastening upon Helen in her relation to Simon the stigma of paramour by reiterating the claim that she was merely a lewd companion, selected by Simon from a Syrian brothel (cf. p. cxlv). In view of the argument already cited for regarding Simon Magus as the deliberately chosen prototype of the Faust of the chap-book, the question arises whether it is at all natural to suppose that the Anonymous would stop short at the figure of Simon and not include his companion Helena, associated with him in the mind of theologians ever since the early centuries of the Christian era. In not a single fragment of the *Faustsage* before 1587 does Helena appear as the companion of Faust. She has nothing whatever to do with the *Faustsage*. She was long regarded as the concubine of Simon Magus. In the *Faustbuch* she becomes the concubine of Faust.

The lewdness of magicians, and especially of witches in their intercourse with the Devil, was a feature of popular belief, formulated by Milichius in his *Zauberteufel*, p. 43, where he quotes the words of Chrysostomus' *de pulchri-*

*tudine et oratione* (cf. p. clxix sq.). Hence the prominence of the rôle assigned by the author to lewd interruptions of Faust's incipient moods of regret and penitence by the Devil, masquerading as a series of beautiful women. The occasion of Faust's fits of penitence is his disappointment at the insufficiency of the Devil's replies to his questions, so that a regular see-saw ensues between *Forscherbegier* and *Gier nach gemeiner Sinnentlust*. As the years of the compact pass, and Faust's desperate strait becomes more obvious to him, the Devil finds it increasingly difficult to devise sensual gratifications adequate to silencing the stings of conscience and pangs of remorse experienced by his victim. Revealing a certain measure of dramatic power, in the Anonymous, there comes towards the very end of Faust's career, as a kind of climax, the desire to possess that paragon of beauty, Helen of Troy, as the fulfillment of the most daring and least possible of all wishes (cf. pp. clxviii, clxix).

Important for an understanding of the chap-book version of Faust's compact with the Devil is Milichius' distinct statement in the tenth chapter of the *Zauberteufel*, p. 92 sq., that the magician has not a passive but an active part in such agreements:

*Er thue was er wöle so ist des alles der Zauberer theylhaftig. Und auss dieser ur-sach muss der Zauberer unterweilen etwas von seinem eygen leibe darzu thun, als har vom haupt oder sonst was. Muss auch etwann den bund, so er mit dem Teuffel machet, mit seinem eygen blut versiegeln.*

Faust's employment of magic, from a thirst of knowledge and from motives of vanity and frivolity

*—nam an sich Adlersflügell, wolt alle gründt am Himmel unnd Erden erforschen. Dann sein fürwitz, frechheit unnd Leichtfertigkeit stach und rayzt jn also, das er auf ein zeit etliche Zauberische vocabula, etc.,*

(W 12; 21 sp.), is foreshadowed by Milichius' regretful statement (p. 87) that men resort to magic *etwaun auss unverständt etwann auss farwitz unnd rhum, dass sie nicht mit andern zustimmen wöllen sondern mehr wissen denn ein ander* and, instead of heeding the revelation of God's Word, devote themselves to temporal, uncertain, and petty investigations, *ja die dinge, welche kein mensch wissen kann noch soll und stehen allein in gottes versehung und gewalt ausgründen wöllen* (p. 261 sq.) (cf. p. clxxv).

Nothing in the compact itself nor in the tradition concerning the situation, suggests the need of its formal renewal five years before the expiration of the stipulated term. Milchsack seems to me, therefore, right in finding significant Milichius' statement (chap. 21, *Von dem Hexenfahren in der Luft*) that there is reason to suppose the Devil occasionally holds conclave with witches and wizards to renew with them the agreement, for fear that, if he depended upon the initial compact, they might backslide and turn again to God. Faust's vacillating nature, his frequent fits of despondency and regret, would naturally suggest the adoption of Milichius' hint (cf. p. clxxxviii).

To avoid a depleted treasury, Faust at the instance of Mephastophiles digs (W 107, 24 sq.) for buried treasure in the crypt of an old chapel near Wittenberg. He discovers a dragon sitting upon the treasure, and by conjuring the creature compels its withdrawal into a cavern. He finds, however, nothing but coal with an accompaniment of spooks. Nothing daunted he brings the coal home, where he finds it has been turned into gold and silver. In the thirty-sixth chapter of his book Milichius tells us of the unholy origin of buried treasure—wrested not infrequently from its rightful possessors, and often explicitly entrusted to the keeping of the Devil by wicked misers—and mentions as a sign of this unholy origin the presence of dogs, toads, and other unclean beasts found lying upon the treasure. He adds that he saw with his own eyes a huge poison dragon lying dead by a cavern, around which a circle had been drawn under which treasure lay buried. He reports the saying that such treasure sometimes disappears or is changed into coal, recalls Lucian's tale of Simon's lusty digging for treasure and fear upon finding it lest it turn to coal, and also Erasmus' words : *Hem, pro thesauro carbones*, and adds that in digging for buried treasure the sight and sound of spooks are common enough (cf. p. clxxxi). Here we certainly have every essential feature of the chap-book record. I have followed Milchsack's argument thus in detail to show concretely the basis of his contention as to the Anonymous' use of Milichius' *Zauberteufel* in ways already specified in my review. Pages clxxxii–ccxliii are devoted to a minute scrutiny of the demonological views of Milichius and their reflection in the chap-book. This strengthens

the argument I have already outlined, although it depends for its value upon the validity of the reasoning thus far.

Omitting from our review of that part of the *Einleitung* entitled *Zusätze* (pp. ccxlv-ccxcvi) Milchsack's disappointed mention of *Meyster Hannsens Lucifers mit seiner gesellschaft val*, Bamberg, 1493 (discovered and reprinted by Jos. Baer & Co., Frankf. a. M. during the printing of Milchsack's book. Cf. the latter's confidence as to its relationship to the chap-book, p. lxxii.), his corroboration by means of this work, probably unknown to the Anonymous, of Dünzter's derivation (Goethe's *Faust* I, Leipzig, 1850, p. 23) of the name Mephistopheles from a half-educated juggler's version of *(ó)μῆ φωτόγιλος* (p. ccii), and also his quotations from Rudolf v. Ems' *Weltchronick*, the *Christherrechronik*, with comparison of the *Kaiserchronik* in their barrenness of suggestions for the Anonymous concerning the *Simonsage* (pp. cclx-cclxvi), we turn for a moment to the third and last of these *Zusätze*, the author's view of Lerchheimer in relation to the chap-book. He claims the latter antedates in its composition Lerchheimer's *Christlich Bedencken und erinnerung von Zauberei* (1585) by some years. The tone of absolute confidence in which Milchsack speaks of this (cf. Footnote, p. cxix):

"Die noch immer allgemein geglaubte Behauptung, dass der Verfasser des Faustbuches Lerchheimer's Arbeit benutzt-habe, ist zweifellos unrichtig. Als Lerchheimer's Buch erschien, war das Volksbuch im Manuscript längst vollendet und wahrscheinlich schon in mehrfachen, Abschriften verbreitet."

implies positive knowledge as to the date of the Wolfenbüttel Ms., that is certainly not utilized in that part of the *Einleitung* already published. Unfortunately this argument is marred by the author's undisguised indignation at what he regards as the unwarranted use made by Wilhelm Meyer, in his *Nüruberger Faustgeschichten*, of the loan to him, before publication, of the Wolfenbüttel Faust Ms. and of those parts of the *Einleitung* already in print. Meyer's attempted refutation (*Faustgeschichten*, p. 23 sq.) of a view of the relationship of Lerchheimer and the Anonymous, entertained neither by him nor by any one else, save Milchsack, can have been suggested, he argues, only by the footnote just quoted at length (cf. pp. ccxiv sq.), and must

have been intended to prejudice these as yet unpublished studies in the eyes of Faust scholars. With no desire to act as umpire in the premises, I cannot help protesting against the introduction into a scientific argument of individual grievances and the confusion of personal pique with impartial zeal for the truth. Bad faith and deficient sense of honor should certainly be punished; they cannot, however, be adequately treated in the midst of the report of an investigation, without detriment to the latter. The spirit of controversy introduced at this point by Milchsack weakens the effect of his evidence by suggesting that he is more anxious to show Meyer to be in error than to arrive at the true state of the case, chap-book author vs. Lerchheimer.

The story of the old man tormented by the Devil because of an attempted conversion of the latter's victim, strong through faith and prayer to scoff at and repel the Evil Spirit, is told by Luther (*Tischreden*, 59, 323), by Lerchheimer (*Christlich Bedencken*, etc., 1585, p. 37), and by the Anonymous (W 98, 24). Meyer defends the generally accepted view of the dependence of the *Faustbuch* version upon that of Lerchheimer and derives the latter from Luther (pp. 24 sq.). Milchsack finds reason to believe the sequence is 1. Luther, 2. *Faustbuch*, and 3. Lerchheimer. To prove this he arranges the three versions in parallel columns (pp. cclxxx-cclxxxiii), distinguishing by different kinds of type agreements between Luther and either of the other two, and between Lerchheimer and the chap-book. For Meyer, Lerchheimer's closer connection with Luther is sufficiently evidenced by the parallelism between the triumphant sneer of the old man in the *Tischreden*: *Ei, Teufel, wie ist dir so recht geschehen; Du sollt sein ein schöner Engel, so bist du zu einer Sau worden* and that in Lerchheimer's story: *Ey, wie ein seine stimm und gesang ist das eines Engels der im Himmel nicht bleiben konnte, gehet jetzt in der leut heuser verwandelt in ein saw*—phrases not found in the chap-book. Milchsack meets this argument by reminding us (p. cclxxxix) that the comparison of devils with swine was commonplace among theologians ever since the New Testament account of the demons permitted by Christ to enter the swine that rushed down a steep place into the sea and were drowned (Matth. 8, 30 sq.). The swinish grunting of the Devil in the old man's chamber, mentioned by the chap-book, would, therefore, naturally suggest to the theologian, Lerchheimer, the sneering comparison, not contained in the *Faustbuch*, especially as a logical improvement (*im Paradies ein Engel, auf*

*Erden eine Sau*) upon the latter's halting expression (*der nicht zwen tag lanng im Paradies bleiben mögen . . unnd hat inn seiner wohnung nicht bleiben können*). (Cf. p. ccxc.) In comparison with this apposite consideration Milchsack's further argument (p. cclxxxviii) that in the two expressions: *bist du zu einer Sau worden* and *verwandelt in ein saw* only two words (*ein, saw*) are actually identical, and that the derivation of the one from the other is hence improbable, seems to me weak and valueless. This thumb-rule reasoning would easily disprove his own conclusions as to the relation of the chap-book to Milichius, or even to Schedel. Its controversial character, hostile to the scientific spirit, is obvious. Milchsack gives on p. cclxxxiv a conspectus of verbal correspondences between the *Tischrede* on the one hand, and the *Faustbuch* and Lerchheimer on the other. Of ten places where the three fail to tally with each other, the *Faustbuch* agrees with the *Tischrede* in eight, Lerchheimer in only three instances. That the chap-book author should have copied Lerchheimer and have accidentally hit upon the exact phraseology of Luther five times in one anecdote, at points where his supposed original was either misleading or silent, is to my mind extremely improbable. Not equally convincing is Milchsack's attempt to derive Lerchheimer from the *Faustbuch*. His rejection (p. cclxxxvi) of the possibility that Lerchheimer followed the *Tischrede* directly seems to me entirely unwarranted by the internal evidence. I regard, therefore, as of little value the brief comparison (footnote, pp. ccxc, ccxi) of the Frankf. print, S, with the Wolfenbüttel Ms., W, intended to show that Lerchheimer must have copied neither of these nor their original, but rather an independent copy of that original.

Without having attempted an exhaustive comparison of S with W, I have noted some points that indicate the earlier origin of W: 1. The *Vorrede* of S, when compared with that of W, seems the substitute of an editor not content with the rather mild didacticism of the latter, and fairly bristles with guides for the protection of the unwary reader. (Cf. the triple quotation of Bible texts on the first two pages.) The preface of W is apparently too descriptive and too historical,—too liable, therefore, in the eyes of the Frankfurt editor to mislead the public. As a remedy he has reduced the historical data to the minimum, substituted an exclamatory sermon by way of warning, and characterized Mephostophiles on the third page of the *Vorrede* as

*einen bösen verfluchten Lügen und Mordtgeist der in der Warheit und Gerechtigkeit nicht bestanden, unnd seiner Sande halben auss dem Himmel in den Abgrund der Hellen verstossen worden, mit Leib unnd Seel, zu zeitlicher unnd ewiger Verdammuss zu eygen ergeben.*

These words contradict Mephostophiles' own description of his estate and frame of mind, (W 24, 32, 35, 32, 36, 27, 41, 27, 56, 10) and

certainly seem inspired by the fear of allowing the assertions in the body of the book to go unchallenged in the preface. Religious zeal furnished the Frankfurt print with a preface different from that of W 2. The anecdotal features of the Frankfurt preface seem to be terse reductions of the more circumstantial and clumsier equivalents of W (cf. the Goldtwurm snake story: W 5, 25 sq; S bottom of p. 7 of *Vorr.*). Also the career and fate of Zoroaster: W 7, 21 sq.; S middle of p. 7 of *Vorr.*). 3. S abounds in stylistic improvements as compared with W that continually suggest an editor who consciously avoids the crudities of his original (cf. the reversion in S of the chapter sequence, 60, 61, and the entire omission of chapter 62, as contained in W, to render Faust's life with Grecian Helen the climax of this part of the work). Sundry other omissions and substitutions, large and small, that cannot safely be studied without access to the Wolfenbüttel Ms. or to an adequate critical apparatus, seem in line with my conviction that W is considerably older than S.

Milchsack's chapters upon *Tendenz* and *Composition* are manifestly incomplete, and were published in this fragmentary condition at the instance of the impatient printer. Judgment as to their value should be suspended until the appearance of their supplements in the second part of Milchsack's studies. My desire for an early appearance of these supplements is stimulated by the realization of the great importance of what he seems to me already to have clearly proven: 1. What Meyer had asserted without proof in his *Nürnberger Faustgeschichten*: that oral and written tradition concerning Faust or still earlier magicians, is the basis of the chap-book in no such sense as has hitherto been supposed; 2. that the chap-book is a *Zauberroman* whose plot is the invention of the Anonymous. 3. That the historical, geographical, and cosmological features of the work owe a large substantial and verbal debt to Schedel's *Cronick*. 4. That Milichius' *Zauberteufel* was studied carefully by the chap-book author, literally quoted in a number of instances, made to yield the ground-work of numerous chapters, phraseologically the work of the Anonymous, and to lend in the person of Simon Magus, and by inference that of his companion, Helena, the outlines of the career of Faust, and, 5. that Lerchheimer's *Christlich Bedenken* can no longer be regarded as the prototype of a portion of the *Faustbuch*.

STARR WILLARD CUTTING.  
University of Chicago.

#### CORRECTION.

MOD. LANG. NOTES, vol. xii, p. 238, footnote: Instead of "The greek letter  $v=u$ ," read " $v=\ddot{u}$ ." The ring over the  $u$  was broken off in a few numbers while passing through the press.